BV 825 .T243
Taylor, James,
The true doctrine of the
Holy Eucharist

THE TRUE DOCTRINE

OF

THE HOLY EUCHARIST,

AS INSTITUTED IN SCRIPTURE,

AND RECEIVED BY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ALL AGES,

IN REFUTATION OF

ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE'S BOOK,

"The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,"

AND THE POPISH VIEWS OF THAT SACRAMENT, IN GENERAL.

BY THE REV. J. TAYLOR, M.A.,

TRIN. COLL. CAM.

HEAD MASTER OF QUEEN ELIZABETH'S FREE GRAMMAR SCHOOL, WAKEFIELD,
AND EVENING LECTURER AT THE PARISH CHURCH.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, & LONGMANS,

PATERNOSTER ROW.

1855.

WAKEFIELD:
CHARLES HICKS, PRINTER, MARKET PLACE.

PREFACE.

SINCE the commencement of the present undertaking, several important changes have taken place in the position of both the persons and matters concerned in it. The "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," when first published by Archdeacon Wilberforce, purposed to be a book of scriptural doctrine, supported by ancient testimonies, for the guidance of members of the Church of England. The author was a beneficed clergyman, and even a dignitary of the ecclesiastical establishment; and his book came upon the Church, recommended not only by the weight of the author's official character, but also by the prestige which appertained to his inheritance of a great name. Under such circumstances, it was no wonder if the work had a large sale and widely-extended influence.

But if the book was hailed with approbation by that party in the Church which acknowledges its object to be to unprotestantize the Church of England, it was received with equal alarm by those faithful to the Reformation. To those who knew anything of the Popish controversy, the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," as propounded by Robert I. Wilberforce, was pure, unalloyed Popery, in all its hideous deformity, hesitating at nothing save the adoption of the *word* transubstantiation, but in everything else adopting not only the doctrines, but even the phraseology, of Trent. For many months the Protestant

world stood in expectation of seeing some official visitation of censure on such manifest treachery, or some vindication, by those in authority, of the cause of truth; but they looked in vain. The only thing which they saw was every effort made, by the cheapening of editions, to push this pestiferous work into every nook and corner of the land, and to extinguish the truth by an overwhelming deluge of error.

When, however, it was found that waiting was vain, either because of the impotence of those in authority, or of their unwillingness to act, some feeble voices were raised, and a decided effort made, by a few earnest men, to bring the matter to a legal issue. The result is known. Conscious of the absolutely-defenceless nature of his position, and of his own entire abjuration of Protestant truth, the Archdeacon of the East Riding pronounced his own sentence, acknowledged his doctrines to be purely those of Rome, and betook himself to the communion of that Church, whose creed he had adopted and taught, more or less, years before.

It is a matter of notoriety, that not a few of the clergy, among the younger especially, have adopted the views of Archdeacon Wilberforce, and unhesitatingly preach them from their pulpits. These, from their comparative obscurity, have, hitherto, for the most part, passed unnoticed; but the case of Archdeacon Denison, who has adopted expressly the views propounded by his brother Archdeacon, is now before the Church and the world, and will probably bring the questions involved to a legal issue.

In reviewing the positions assumed by Mr. Wilberforce, and now adopted by Archdeacon Denison, I have sought rather that confutation should come from the authorities adduced for that purpose, than from any reasoning of my own. On this ground it is that I have quoted *largely;* and not on this ground only but that every reader might be enabled to feel satisfied that he

had the true views of the writers referred to, which, by short and dovetailed extracts, can never be the case. I must confess, that with regard to the testimony of the ancient Church, my own opinion has been changed by this enquiry. I had not before so thorough a conviction, as now I have, that Popery can lay no claim to its authority. The strongest expressions used are generally either explained or limited by the Fathers who use them, while the peculiar doctrines of Rome are sought for in their writings in vain; — statements are found which could never have been made, had the peculiarities of Trent's teaching been known to the early Church. I rise from the labour which has necessarily attended this investigation, thankful to that good Providence which has preserved to our day the valuable records of the primitive Christian Church.

In the examination into, and comparison of, the several Protestant Confessions, an agreeable surprise has also been the result, in witnessing their general agreement and scriptural character. I find these confessions, on the subject of our enquiry, as far removed from Socinian coldness and emptiness, as from the superstitious and unmeaning awe and meretricious pomp of Popery. In protesting against the subtractions of the one and the additions of the other, I find these confessions all but unanimous. Theirs is no uncertain or discordant sound; but the constant reproach which is sought to be cast upon the various bodies of Protestant Christians, on account of their differences, is found to be more imaginary than real. It is only a pity that these bodies do not more consider the important and essential points in which they agree, rather than the minor ones in which they differ, and so present a more compact and resolute front to the common enemy. Rome, if ever she gains a triumph over Protestant truth, can only do so by dividing before she conquers.

As an appendix, I have given the "Book of Ratram (or

Bertram) on the Eucharist," which has providentially escaped the ravages of time, and the more fatal hands of the emissaries of the Pope, as well as some exceedingly valuable Saxon remains —all of which are directly opposed to the doctrine of a corporeal presence. Following these will be found a few original notes and extracts from authors not in the hands of every one. It is hoped that these will be considered valuable and important for the purpose for which they are given.

I should have been glad had I been enabled to give *all* the passages which are quoted or referred to *in their original*, but this would have swelled out the volume to a much larger size and price. As it is, the more important are given in their original form and language, and will enable those who desire it to see that the sense of their authors is faithfully given. It seems to some perfectly unaccountable how any man, brought up as a Protestant, with a liberal education and the Bible in his hands, can renounce his religion and embrace Romanism, and there is, unquestionably, very much in it to astonish. But it too often happens, with even the Bible itself, that it is perverted to the support of preconceived opinions, rather than examined for the truths which it teaches. It seems to me to be by such a process that men are led astray. They neither examine Scripture nor consult the early writers of the Christian Church with the feeling that the one is supreme, and the other useful in the teaching of truth, resolved to submit to the latter wherever they find it; but having embraced principles, according to taste and feeling, they then ransack the pages of inspired and uninspired antiquity to find support for their preconceived views. It can be little matter of surprise if such persons be given up to "strong delusions," and to the belief of lies, when they search through even the charter of their salvation for means of arriving at victory, not at truth.

In conclusion, I have only to apologise for whatever defects may be detected in this volume, either in matter or style, by alleging, in extenuation, the daily demands of a laborious occupation. The work which the reader has in his hand does not pretend to much. It is more of a compilation than of an original essay, which seeks to let the persons introduced speak for themselves. It is not often that either the clergy or the laity have opportunities, ability, and leisure for lengthened investigations into the writings of Christian antiquity; and it is only in an abbreviated form that the results of more favoured scholars can be made available for the many. The sources whence my information has been derived are generally indicated in the proper place; and to the authors, whose works are quoted, I must refer those who wish further to pursue their enquiries.

In one word—may it please God to grant that this feeble effort may be of some little service to the truth in the present crisis of the Church. The ecclesiastical horizon is certainly full of ominous forebodings of storm, and it may please Him who has so long blessed us with light, to punish our unworthy use of it, by removing our candlestick out of its place. Our only hope for the averting of such a calamity must be in the blessing of God upon the *efforts* and upon the *prayers* of His faithful people. It can scarcely be doubted but that, if they are unremitting in *both*, the divine favour will be vouchsafed, and that speedily. The labour and prayer are from below, the blessing and power are from above; the benefit is ours—the glory is God's.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

THE ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE IN DECIDING CONTROVERSIES OF FAITH, AND THE RIGHT USE OF THE FATHERS.

Testimony of the Church of England on this point, 1. Her rule not to propound anything contrary to Scripture and inconsistent with Catholic teaching, 2. English Church places the Fathers where they have placed themselves, 3. Augustine's testimony, 3, 4. Jerome's, 5, 6. Various reasons why the Fathers could not be arbiters in our present controversies, 7. Bishop Warburton on this point, 8. Jeremy Taylor, 11. Hooker, 13.

CHAPTER II.

CONSECRATION, AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST, NOT ESSENTIALLY DIFFERENT FROM CONSECRATION, WHEN USED IN OTHER CASES.

Doctrine of Archdeacon Wilberforce on this point, 15. Limit to his phraseology, 16. True idea of consecration (Augustine), 17. Our Lord intended direct reference to the bread, and to nothing else, when he said *this*, 17, 18. No scriptural testimony on consecrating water in baptism, 19. Testimony of the early Church (Bingham), 19. Tertullian and Cyprian, 20. The effects of consecration were supposed the same in baptism as in the Lord's Supper—testimonies of various Fathers, 21—23. Nothing can be safely deduced from the names appropriated to sacred symbols, 24. Further attempt of the Archdeacon to establish an essential distinction between consecration in the Eucharist and in baptism, by alleging an essential difference between the sacraments themselves, 24—26.

CHAPTER III.

THERE IS NO ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO SACRAMENTS, BAPTISM AND THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

Church of England's definition of a sacrament, 27. Water the outward sign, the Holy Spirit "the inward part or thing signified" in baptism —Scripture testimony, 27, 28. Opinions of various Fathers, 30—33. Table exhibiting the parallelism of the two sacraments, 34. Minister of both sacraments the same (Scripture testimony), 35; (of the Fathers), 36—38. The same proved by a passage, quoted by Mr. Wilberforce, from Chrysostom, 40. Practice of the English Church immediately after the Reformation, 41. Lay-baptism disallowed by Forbes, Lawrence, Taylor, &c., 41. Foreign churches divided in opinion, 42. Reasons why baptizing might have been delegated to lay-persons, but not the celebration of the Lord's Supper, 42, 43. Instances of deacons consecrating the Eucharist, 44, 45. Testimony of St. Ambrose, 46. Two reasons why such instances are few, 46. Answer to the question, "Why is not consecration put more prominently forward by our divines?" 48. There is, then, no essential distinction between the two sacraments, 49.

CHAPTER IV.

CHRIST IS NOT PRESENT IN THE EUCHARIST BY A CORPOREAL PRESENCE IN ANY MANNER—*i.e.*, NEITHER NATURALLY NOR SACRAMENTALLY.

Subject (*this*) and predicate (*my body*) identical, according to Mr. Wilberforce, 51. Attempted to be proved from the Fathers, 52. No safe conclusion to be drawn from names and epithets, 53. Gregory Nyssen on the change effected by consecration, 54. The testimony of various Fathers to Christ's corporeal absence, 55, 56. The Archdeacon's mode of solving the difficulty of multifarious presence, 57, 58. Opinions of the Fathers on it, 59, 60. Decree of the Council of Jerusalem on transubstantiation, A.D. 1672, 61. "The gift" in the Eucharist not different from that in any other religious ordinance, 62. Opinion of Fathers, 63. Such sentences as "Believe, and thou hast eaten," refute the idea of transubstantiation, 64. Language of Jesus in John vi. considered, 65. Antagonism to this of Romish teaching, 66. Impossibility to reconcile Scripture and Popery on this point, 67. Testimony of the Fathers as to the faithful *alone* partaking of Christ, 67—70. Article of the English Church on same point, 71. Blasphemous opinions of the Romish doctors, 72. Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges Origen to be *apparently* against him, 73.

CHAPTER V.

THE ANCIENT FATHERS DID NOT WORSHIP CHRIST "IN THE ELEMENTS," NOR DID THEY CONSIDER THESE, NOR CHRIST IN THEM, A PROPITIATORY OFFERING FOR THE SINS OF THE LIVING AND THE DEAD.

Mr. Wilberforce's opinion stated, 75. Instance of Jesuitical reasoning, 76. Christ, in His human nature, limited as to place, 76. Adoration of the host absolute idolatry, 77. Homilies misapplied and misinterpreted, 78, 79. Manifest Jesuitry of the Archdeacon, 80 (note). Sense of expression, "Christ ought to be worshipped *in the sacrament*," 82. Fathers on the same point, 83. Ambiguity of language used, 84. Examination of passages brought to prove the adoration (Anastatius Sinaita), 86 ; Cyril Hier., 87 ; Chrysostom, 88. Case of the Energumeni, 89, 90. False reasoning and puerility, 90, 91. Theodoret too strong for Mr. Wilberforce, 92. A prayer in St. Chrysostom's liturgy considered, 93. Leontius, who ? 94. Ambrose and Augustine on 98th Psalm, 94, 95. General remarks on the subject, 96. Mr. Albertine's summary out of Augustine, 97. Mr. Daillé's, 98—101. Mr. Whitby's, 101. If the adoration of the host had existed in the primitive or mediæval Church, we must have known it, 102, 103. In what sense the Eucharist is a *sacrifice* according to Mr. Wilberforce, 104—106. Difference between Bishop of Exeter and Archdeacon Wilberforce, 106. Consideration of passages of Scripture brought in proof (Melchisedec), 107. St. Paul ignorant of Mr. Wilberforce's ideas, 108. The significance of ancient sacrifices, 109, 110. Jesus Christ the great antitype of all Jewish sacrifices, 110—112. This lost sight of in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," 112. Date of Christ's appointment to His mediatorial office, 113, 114. Antagonism of Mr. Wilberforce's views to Scripture, as also of the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist" to the Epistle to the Hebrews, 115. Explanation of Hebrews xiii., 10 ; 116. Proper reference, 117, 118. No reference to the Eucharist, 119. St. Paul often classes himself with Jews, 120. Paraphrase of the whole passage, 120, 121. The question, "Is there any scriptural testimony that the Eucharistic sacrifice is a sin-offering ?" answered, 122. Not the Eucharist, but Christ's sacrifice, the antitype of the Jewish sin-offering, 123. The prophesy of Malachi considered, 124. It does not refer to the Eucharist, 125. Superiority of Christ's sacrifice over the Jewish, 126. Concluding remarks on alleged Scripture evidence, 127. The evidence of the Fathers entered upon, 128. How they are to be understood, 129. The case stated by the Archdeacon, 129—131. In what sense the words sacrifice, oblation, &c., were used in Scripture, 131 ; and by the Fathers, 133. In what sense applied to the Eucharist, 133—135. (1.) The gifts presented by the worshippers called *offerings*, 135, 136. (2.) The terms oblation, offering, &c., were

applied to the whole Eucharistic service, 137. Instances from the Fathers, 138. Proofs that the idea of the sacrifice of the mass could not have been that of the early Christian apologists, 139—141. (3.) The whole sacramental service called a sacrifice, 143. By the Fathers, from its representing Christ's sacrifice, 144—146. General expressions limited by the Church of Rome, 147. Summary of senses in which ante-Nicene Fathers use words sacrifice, offering, oblation, &c., 149—151.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ANCIENT LITURGIES.

Justin Martyr's account of the mode of celebration of the Eucharist in his day, 152, 153. Form in the apostolic constitutions, 154, 155. The Liturgy of St. James, 156. Exception to Renaudot's canon for testing the liturgies, 157, 158. Dr. Hickes on interpolations, &c., in liturgies, 159, 160. Comparison of the Clementine liturgy with that of St. James, 161. Summary of contents of the former, 162. Additional articles in that of St. James, 163. Brett and Renaudot on ante-Nicene form of ditto, 164, 165. Table of five liturgies (note), 166, 167. Little use made of contents of liturgies by Mr. Wilberforce, 168. What change do the liturgies contemplate? 169, 170. Elements called by their proper names *after consecration*, 171, 172. No adoration of the host found in the ancient liturgies, 173. Boileau's difficulty, 174. Prayer offered in liturgies to Christ as in heaven, 176. Fathers ditto, 177. Popish view adopted in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," 178. Mr. Wilberforce's attempt to obviate the difficulty of the invocation of the Holy Spirit *after* consecration, 179. Morton on unwarranted innovations of Rome, 180—185. Bingham's summary of the Fathers, 186—189. *The offering* in the liturgies, what? 189. St. James's, 190. St. Mark's, 191. St. Chrysostom's, 192. St. Basil's, 193. Sacramentary of Gregory, 194. Codices sacramentorum, 195. Summary, 196—198.

CHAPTER VII.

THE FATHERS UPON THE EFFECTS OF CONSECRATION.

Examination of Mr. Wilberforce's patristical authorities, 199. His statement of his case, 200. Passage from St. Ambrose considered, 201. Bishop Stillingfleet on, 202. Passage from St. Cyril, 203. Ditto from Gregory Nyssen, 203, 204. Bishop Stillingfleet on, 205. Passage from Gaudentius, 206, 207. Mr. Wilberforce's *nine* propositions—first, 207; second and third, 208; fourth, fifth, and sixth, 209; seventh and eighth, 210; ninth, in what sense is the Christian Church said to be *offered* in the Eucharist? 211.

CHAPTER VIII.

A CONSIDERATION OF SOME PARTICULAR USAGES IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH RESPECTING THE EUCHARIST.

Difference of relative and inherent holiness, 213. Why the efficacy of the elements is denied, 214. Intercommunion considered, 215. The Christian *Agapæ*, 215—217. Intercommunion not confined to interchange of sacramental elements, 217. Probable effects of reserve—Trajan and Tertullian, 219. Conduct of Gorgonia considered, 221; and practice of burying the Eucharist, 221; of burning it, 222; of mixing the wine with ink, 222. Days distinguished for consecrating, 223. "Whole Christ in each particle," 224. Dr. Covel's account of the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 1672, 224 (note). Mr. Wilberforce's infatuation and confusion, 226. Half-communion, 228. Story of Serapion and child, 229—231. Different language of the ancient and Romish Church, 231. The Archdeacon's dishonesty—(1.) In quoting Augustine, 232; and (2.) Overall, Cosin, Hooker, Taylor, 234. (3.) In explaining away declarations and protests of the Church of England, 234. (4.) In ignoring all former replies to his authorities, 235. Summary, 236.

BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE USE OF MATERIAL SYMBOLS IN RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

We cannot understand their operation, 239. Evils of inquisitiveness and ignorance, 240. The effect of symbols not understood, 240. No virtue inherent in them, 240. Instances under the Jewish economy, 241—243; in the Christian, 243—245. Use of the Eucharistic symbols analogous, 245. Apostles might connect the *eating* and *drinking* in the discourse at Capernaum with the Eucharist when instituted, 246, 247. This sacrament more than a commemorative rite, 247, 248. Virtue of the Eucharist not *in*, but *through* the elements, 249. View of the Church of England, 25th Art. 250. Character of sacraments complex, 251. Difference between sacraments and ceremonies, 252. God's part and man's in the Eucharist, 253. True value of sacramental symbols, 254. Bishop Burnet's statement of different views, 255, 256. Making symbols channels not Popish doctrine, 256. Bishop Ridley's view, 257. Difference between the Common Prayer of 1549 and 1552, 258. Efficiency of symbols taught in Articles, 259. And in catechism, 259.

CHAPTER II.

A REVIEW OF THE PASSAGES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT HAVING SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE EUCHARIST.

History and words of the institution, 262. Analogical interpretation of "this is my body," &c., 262. Oriental and Jewish forms of speech, 262. Bishop Williams, on τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, 263. Romanists differ in *their* explanation of the same, 264. Not a proposition of identity—Bishop Kidder, 265. The Council of Trent, Bellarmine, and Vasquez, on the reference in τοῦτο, 267. The early Fathers on ditto, 268—271. The discourse at Capernaum, 272. Bishop Cleaver's view, 273. Reference to Eucharist being admitted, this discourse helps not transubstantiation, 274. But probably no such reference intended, but language strictly figurative, 275. Opinions of the Fathers, 276—284. General conclusion therefrom, 284. Consideration of 1 Cor. x., 285. Waterland's summary of opinions, 286. Dr. Pelling, on the words, "partakers of the altar," 288—291. True view of the passage, 291. Locke's comment on it, 291. Review of 1 Cor. xi., 20—29, 292. "Guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" has no literal significance. 293. These words compared with similar phraseology, 294, 295. Old and New Testament consentaneous, 296. Resembling circumstances in the Jewish and Christian passover—(1.) in the things themselves 296; (2.) in phrases and forms, 297—300.

CHAPTER III.

TESTIMONIES IN ALL CENTURIES, FROM THE FIFTH TO THE FIFTEENTH, IN FAVOUR OF THE PROTESTANT VIEW OF THE EUCHARIST.

Weight and cumulation of evidence, 302. Testimony of Theodoret, 302, 303. Testimony in the sixth century—of Fulgentius, 304; of Primasius, Gaudentius, and Euphraimius, 305. In the seventh century, of Isidore of Seville and Hesychius, 306. In the eighth century, of Bede and Alcuin, 306, 307. In the ninth century, of Raban Maur, 308; of Haymo, 309; of Druthmar, 310. The credit of these writers belongs chiefly to the English Church, 311. Of Scotus and Bertram, 312. Providential preservation of Bertram's treatise, 313 (note). Evidence, in the tenth century, 314. Testimony of Ælfric—his homily, 315; his letters, 315—317. Utterly condemnatory of transubstantiation, 318. These exhibit the doctrine of the Church at that time, 319. In the eleventh century—Lanfranc and Berengarius, 319. Various forms of recantation prescribed to Berengarius, 320. Absurdity of whole Christ under each particle, 320—322 (note). Berengarius not solitary in his opposition, 323. In the twelfth century—of Gratian, 323; Johannes Semeca, Zacharius Chrysopolitanus, and Rupertus, 324. The Waldenses and Albigenses, 325. Extract from

their "Treatise on Antichrist," 326; from the "Noble Lesson," 327. Reasons why testimony scanty in this and following ages, 328. Testimony of "Index of Valdensic errors," and Conrad of Magdenberg, 328. Of Duns Scotus, 329. Bellarmine's testimony to Scotus's doctrine, 330. Cuthbert Tonstall, Bishop of Durham's, evidence (*apud* Gilpin), 331. Council of Lateran, A.D, 1215, first established transubstantiation, 332. Evidence in the fourteenth century, 332; of William of Oakham, 332, 333; of Durandus, 334; of Wickliffe, 334. In the fifteenth century—of Waldenses, 335; of Petrus de Alliaco, of Biel, of Cajetan, of Suarez, 336. Opposition of these to decrees of Lateran, 337. Confession of Vallenses of Piedmont, 338—340.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HARMONY OF PROTESTANT CONFESSIONS ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST.

Suitability of characters raised up for the work of the Reformation, 341. Luther only applied the match to the train, 342. The *identity* of the antecedent demands for reformation, and those effected in the sixteenth century, 342. Scarcely any *essential* difference of opinion on the subject of Eucharist among Protestant Churches, 343.

Extracts from Protestant Confessions.

I.	From the Latter Confession of Helvetia,	. .	344—50
II.	„ Former „	. .	350—55
III.	„ Confession of Basle,	. . . .	355—56
IV.	„ „ Bohemia,	. . .	356—61
V.	„ „ France,	. . . .	361—63
VI.	„ „ England,	. . .	363—67
VII.	„ „ Scotland,	. . . .	367—68
	„ „ Do. (*Westminster Divines*)		368—70
VIII.	„ „ Belgia,	. . . .	370—73
IX.	„ „ Augsburg,	. . .	373—88
X.	„ „ Saxony,	. . . .	389—97
XI.	„ „ Wirtemburg,	. .	397-404
XII.	„ „ Sueveland,	. . .	405-409

Identity of doctrine indicates identity of its origin, 409.

CHAPTER V.

THE BELIEF OF THE GREEK CHURCH ON THE ARTICLE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

No pure Greek ecclesiastical writer used a word equivalent to transubstantiation, 411. Their *strongest* language no evidence of such belief (Cabasilas), 413. Mr. Arnaud quotes unfairly, 413. The Greeks do not believe that the words of consecration transubstantiate elements,

—Mr. Claude's instances, 414—417. Greeks teach that the wicked do not receive the body and blood of Christ in Eucharist—instances, 418—420. Claude's conclusions thereon, 420. Cabasilas on *the thing* received in the Lord's Supper, 421 ; and *mode* of reception, 422 ; and *who* receive, 422. Claude's reflections, 423. Greek Church does not adore the host, 424. Testimony of Stephen Stylite, 424 ; of Damascene, 425. Damascene on the worship of the Trinity, 426. Romanists acknowledge this *defect* in the worship of the Greeks, 426, 427. Testimony of modern Greeks — of Christopher Angelus, 428 ; of Metrophanus Critopulas, 428 ; of Melitius, 429. Declaration of Jeremias, 429. Confession of Cyrillus Lucar, 430. Belief of the Syrian Church of Malabar, 430. Decree of the Council of Diamper, 431. Conclusive evidence of this decree to the ancient faith of the Syrian Church, 432. Conclusion, 423.

APPENDIX.

PAGE

Book of Ratramn on the Body and Blood of the Lord, . . . vii
Paschal Homily of Ælfric, from the reprint of 1623, . . . xxxix
Appendix A. On Baptismal Regeneration, ... xlix
Appendix B. Defence of assertion in Catechism, " in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," liv
Appendix C. On the *nature* of a Sacrament, ... lviii
Appendix D. Extract from Augustine's Commentary on the 99th Psalm, ... lix
Appendix E. Extract from Cyprian, Epis. 63. Ox. ed. . . lxi
Appendix F. Extract from Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, on sacrifices, ... lxix
Appendix G. Justin Martyr's account of mode of celebrating the Eucharist in his days, ... lxxii
Appendix G (*continued*). The Clementine Liturgy, . . . lxxiv
Appendix H. Extract from Augustine's Commentary on John vi. lxxxiii
Appendix I. Dr. Claggett's Paraphrase on John vi. . . . lxxxix
Appendix K. Birkbeck's summary of Patristical Evidence on the Eucharist, for first five centuries, in reply to Bellarmine's "*Synopsis Patrum*," cxxii

ERRATA.

Page 41, bottom line, for "Zuingluis," read "*Zuinglius*."
„ 149, line 30,—and in pp. 159, 165, 224 (note, line 1),—for "anti-Nicene," read *ante-Nicene*.
„ 294, line 28, for "cases," read *causes*.
„ 304, at foot, insert, *see Appendix K*.
„ 429, line 8, for "ever," read *every*.
Preface to Appendix—page v, line 2, for "their," read *there*.

BOOK I.

THE TRUE DOCTRINE

OF

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

CHAPTER I.

THE ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE IN DECIDING CONTROVERSIES, AND THE RIGHT USE OF THE FATHERS.

THE first thing to be settled, in the conducting of a controversy, is the ultimate authority to which the disputants will defer. This the Church of England has done, in her controversy with that of Rome, in a manner at once singularly satisfactory and full. "Holy Scripture," she says, "containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."—(*Art.* vi.) And this statement she cautiously guards against Church authority in these words:—"It is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation"—(*Art.* xx.); and against general councils as follows:—"Things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture."—(*Art.* xxi.)

After these explicit declarations, not only of the absolute sufficiency and supremacy of Scripture *per se*, but also of the subjection of churches and councils to its authority, there can be no suspicion that the Church of England recognizes the *ipse dixit* of any particular Father, or intends her children to bow to the private opinion of any individual of the ancient Church. She who can say of the whole of any age assembled together, "Forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God"—(*Art.* xxi.), cannot give to one an authority which she denies to the whole, nor recognize in division a strength which she does not allow in combination.

But we are told that the convocation which imposed subscription to the articles, prescribed this rule for the guidance of preachers, viz., "that they were not to propound anything except that which is consistent with the teaching of the Old and New Testament, and that which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have deduced from its teaching." Now this rule appears to us not only to be a very good one in itself, but does not seem to be at all at variance with the solemn judgment of the Church, as expressed in her articles above quoted. Nay, the Church might have gone further, and have *recommended* the study of the ancient Fathers as of great assistance in the elucidation and understanding of Scripture, and generally helping in its exegesis. But surely this would no more have been to recognize them as an authority, than would the recommendation of Scott's, or D'Oyly and Mant's Commentary be an exaltation of these into the place of an unquestioned arbiter. A testimonial for orders required by every bishop from three beneficed clergymen runs—"Nor hath he at any time, as far as we know or believe, held, written, or taught anything contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the united Church of England and Ireland." But surely no one who signs such a document imagines that he, by such phraseology, makes the formularies of the English

Church as of equal authority with the written word of God. Yet such a conclusion would be just as natural from these words as that, by the limitation above expressed with regard to the Fathers, they were to be deemed beyond question, as having "authority in matters of faith."

In assigning to the early bishops of the Christian Church this subordinate place, the Church of England has only adopted the suggestions of common sense, and placed the Fathers where they have placed themselves. The very idea of a written revelation from heaven must put every other authority into the shade, and the writers of the primitive Church were ever and unanimously anxious not only to defer themselves to the authority of divine revelation, but were very careful to give a catalogue of the books which they considered inspired. It is not to be denied, that sometimes these men use phrases which might seem, when taken abstractedly, to claim for themselves something like inspiration; but all those expressions are very fairly interpretable in consistence with sound doctrine; for when they say they speak "by the Spirit," they only mean that which is meant by the same expression among religious persons in this day. The pious prayer of the minister of God in the pulpit for divine direction, or the assertion by him that he declares "the counsel of God," are expressions of exactly the same kind as those to which we have referred in the Fathers.

To make this apparent, and in vindication of the assertion above, that the Fathers placed themselves in entire subordination to the written records of heaven, two or three passages shall be adduced. These will at once prove the whole point, and fully vindicate the English Church in giving but a qualified sanction to what is found in the writings of the early Fathers. When Augustine, in a contest with Jerome, had some half dozen Greek Fathers alleged against him by the latter, he says:

"I confess, that I only owe to those books of Scripture which are now called canonical, that reverence and honour, as to believe stedfastly that none of their authors ever committed any error in writing the

same. And if by chance I there meet with any thing, which seemeth to contradict the truth, I immediately think that either my copy is imperfect, and not so correct as it should be; or else, that the interpreter did not so well understand the words of the original: or lastly, that I myself have not so rightly understood him. But as for all other writers, however eminent they are, either for sanctity or learning, I read them in such manner as not instantly to conclude that whatever I there find is true, because they have said it; but rather, because they convince me, either out of the said canonical books of Scripture, or else by some probable reason, that what they say is true. Neither do I think, brother, that thou thyself art of any other opinion: that is to say, I do not believe that thou expectest that we should read thy books, as we do those of the Prophets or Apostles; of the truth of whose writings, as being exempt from all error, we may not in anywise doubt."*

And again, when he had himself brought against Jerome some other writers, he says expressly that he does not quote them as *authorities:*

"I have alleged these," he says, "notwithstanding that, to say the truth, I account the canonical Scriptures only to be the books to which (as I said before) I owe that ingenuous duty, as to be fully persuaded that the authors of them never erred, or deceived the reader in any thing."†

And again, after saying we make a distinction between the books of later writers, and the excellency of the canonical authority of the Old and New Testament, he proceeds:

* Ego enim fateor caritati tuæ solis eis Scripturarum libris, qui jam canonici appellantur, didici hunc timorem, honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum auctorem scribendo aliquid errasse firmissimè credam. Ac si aliquid in eis offendero litteris, quod videatur contrarium veritati, nihil aliud quàm mendosum esse codicem, vel interpretem non assequutum esse quid dictum est, vel me minimè intellexisse, non ambigam. Alios autem ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate, doctrinaque præpolleant, non ideo verum putem, quia ipsi ita senserunt, sed quia mihi, vel per illos auctores canonicos, vel probabili ratione, quod à vero non abhorreat, persuadere potuerunt. Nec te, mi frater, sentire aliquid aliter existimo: prorsus inquam, non te arbitror sic legi libros tuos velle tanquam Prophetarum vel Apostolorum, de quorum scriptis, quod omni errore careant, dubitare nefarium est.—*August. ep. ad Hier. quæ est* 19. *t.* 2. *fol.* 14. *ed. Paris.* 1579, *et enter Op. Hier.* 97. *t.* 2. *p.* 551.

† Quanquam, sicut paulò antè dixi, tantummodo Scripturis canonicis hanc ingenuam debeam servitutem, qua eas solas ita sequar, ut conscriptores earum nihil in eis omninò errasse, nihil fallaciter posuisse non dubitem.—*Id. ibid.*

"As for the writings of those other authors who have come after them, the number whereof is almost infinite, though coming very far short of this most sacred excellency of the canonical Scriptures, a man may sometimes find in them the very same truth, though it shall not be of equal authority. Therefore if by chance we here meet with such things as seem contrary to the truth, by reason, perhaps, of our not understanding them only, we have our liberty, either in reading or hearing the same, to approve of what we like, and to reject that which we conceive not to be right. So that except all such passages be made good, either by some certain reason, or else by the canonical authority of the Scriptures: and that it be made to appear, that what is asserted either really is, or else at least that it might have been; he that shall reject or not assent to the same, ought not in any wise to be reprehended."*

And that Augustine was not wrong in attributing to his opponent the same opinion of the absolute superiority and unapproachableness of the inspired books, is seen by Jerome's own testimony to the same effect. In the preface to his second Commentary upon Hosea, he says:

"Then (that is, after the authors of books are once departed this life) we judge of their worth and parts only, not considering at all the dignity of their name: and the reader has regard only to what he reads, and not to the author of the work. So that whether he were a bishop or a layman, a general and a lord, or a common soldier and a servant; whether he lie in purple and silk, or in the vilest and coarsest rags, he shall be judged, not according to his degree of honour, but according to the merit and worth of his works."†

* In opusculis autem posteriorum, quæ libris innumerabilibus continentur, sed nullo modo illi sacratissimæ canonicarum Scripturarum excellentiæ coæquantur, etiam in quibuscumque eorum invenitur eadem veritas, longe tamen est impar auctoritas. Itaque in eis, si qua forte propterea dissonare putantur à vero, quia non, ut dicta sunt, intelliguntur, tamen liberum ibi habet lector, auditorve judicium quo vel approbet quod placuerit, vel improbet quod offenderit: et ideo cuncta ejusmodi, nisi vel certa ratione, vel ex illa canonica auctoritate defendantur, ut demonstretur sive omnino ita esse, sive fieri potuisse, quod vel disputatur ibi, vel narratum est, si cui displicuerit, aut credere voluerit, non reprehenditur.—*August. Ep. ad Hier. l.* 11, *contra. Faust. c.* 5.

For further declarations of the same character, see August. Ep. ad Hier. t. 2. Epist. 48, ep. 111, t. 3, l. 1, 3, de Trinit. c. 2, l. 3, præfat. l. 5, c. 1, t. 7, l. 2, contr. crescon. Gram. c. 31, et c. 32, l. 2, de Bapt. contr. Don. c. 3, l. 3, de Peccat. mer. et rem c. 7, c. 1, de Nat. et grat. c. 61, l. 4, contr. de ep. Pelag. c. 8, l. 1, contr. Julian. c. 2, l. de bon. persever. c. 21.

† Tunc sine nominum dignitate, sola judicantur ingenia; nec considerat, qui

Again, when speaking of the Fathers (as we call them) in general, he says:

"It may be that they have erred out of mere ignorance, or else that they wrote in some other sense than we understand them; or that their writings have been corrupted, through the ignorance of the transcribers; or else before the appearing of that impudent devil Arius, in the world, they let some things fall from them innocently, and not so warily as they might have done; and such as can hardly escape the cavils of wrangling spirits."*

We are not, therefore, at all surprised at the following rule of Jerome, respecting the Fathers, and it is a thoroughly Protestant one:

"Read Origen, Tertullian, Novatus, Arnobius, Apollinaris, and others of the ecclesiastical writers; but with this caution, that we should make choice of that which is good, but take heed of embracing that which is not so; according to the apostle, who bids us prove all things, but hold fast only that which is good."†

In short, with regard to the very works to which, in these days, some would refer us as to authorities, Jerome himself says:

"And thus have I briefly delivered to you my opinion; but if any one produce that which is more exact and true, take his exposition rather than mine."‡

lecturus est, cujus, sed quale sit quod lecturus est, sive sit episcopus, sive sit laicus, imperator et dominus, miles et servus, aut in purpura et serico, aut vilissimo panno jaceat, non honorum diversitate, sed operum merito judicabitur.—*Hier. Com.* 2, *in Oseam, Præfat.*

* Fieri enim potest, ut vel simpliciter erraverint, vel alio sensu scripserint, vel à librariis imperitis eorum paulatim scripta corrupta sint; vel certè antequàm in Alexandria quasi dæmonium meridianum Arius nasceretur, innocenter quædam, et minùs cautè loquuti sunt, et quæ non possint perversorum hominum calumniam declinare.—*Hier. l.* 2. *Apol. contra. Ruff.*

† Ego Origenem propter eruditionem sic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum, Novatum, Arnobium, Apollinarium, et nonnullos ecclesiasticos scriptores, Græcos pariter, et Latinos, ut bona eorum eligamus, vitemusque contraria; juxta apostolum dicentem, Omnia probate; quod bonum est tenete.—*Id. Ep.* 76, *ad Tranquil.*

‡ Si quis autem his sagaciora et veriora repererit, illi magis explanationi præbete consensum.—*Hier. Com.* 2. *in Abac.*

Again: Si quis autem magis verisimilia, et habentia rationem, quam à nobis sunt disserta, repererit, illius magis lector auctoritate ducatur.—*Id. in Sophon.*

And, Hæc ut quivimus, ut vires ingenioli nostri ferre potuerunt, loquuti sumus, et Hebræorum et nostrorum varias opiniones breviter perstringentes. Si quis melius, imo verius dixerit; et nos libenter melioribus acquiescimus.—*Hier. Com. in Zach.*

Now, surely no sane man would deny that it would be doing a double wrong to force upon these Fathers a position which they refuse, and an authority which they repudiate; — a wrong, in the first instance, to the supremacy of God's word, and next to the writings of these men who emphatically disclaim any authority for them. He is not the individual to do honor to Augustine, who forces him into an unwilling rivalry with St. Paul, and who compels us to vindicate Jerome's estimate of his own works, by ransacking them for proofs of their fallibility. The Church of England gives to the ancient writers just that place which reason and themselves claim, and which the supreme authority of the inspired records nowhere disallows.

If it were necessary, we might shew that it is impossible that the Fathers could be called in to decide the controversies of the present day from the scantiness of the writings of the first three centuries, and from the absence in what we have of any reference to the subjects now in dispute amongst us. It is well known, also, that the writings of the Fathers have been very largely corrupted by interpolations, omissions, and absolute forgeries, so that there is no certainty that what we have in our hands are the writings of those whose names they bear. Furthermore, the difficulties, which are alleged to lie in the way of understanding the Sacred Scriptures, lie equally against understanding the writings of the Fathers, — difficulties, I mean, arising from their obsolete languages, different customs, countries, and ages. The Fathers, too, were not always honest men themselves, — they acknowledge to concealment and reservation in stating their own opinions and those of their adversaries, and of using arguments to silence an opponent, which he acknowledged to be valid, but they did not. The Fathers, too, like all other men, often changed their opinions, and recanted in later life what they considered the errors of their earlier days. We have no certainty, moreover, that in the writings which are extant, we have the views of the ancient Church fairly and fully represented. Fathers wrangled with Fathers, as well as with confessed heretics; and who is to say,

which is to be considered the champion of the Church? It may be that neither of them was, or that each had many followers. Such things happen to-day, and for aught we can see to the contrary, such was likely to be the case in the earlier ages of the Church's history. Of this, however, there can be no question, many of the Fathers have held very different and very erroneous opinions, and that too on questions of vital importance; and it is not to be wondered at, that, after all the lofty claims made on behalf of the early ecclesiastical writers, and the lowly deference professed to be paid to them, neither Protestant nor Papist receives more of any than he feels convenient, and unhesitatingly repudiates what is not to his liking. Professions are easy, but we really find neither party giving an unqualified adherence to any writer, however much he may be the object of their boast.

Those who wish to see more on this subject may well consult "Daillé on the right use of the Fathers." It is possible that this learned foreigner depreciates too much the value of ecclesiastical testimony. This, however, is not the danger among ourselves in the present day. The reader may be glad to see the view of the whole matter as it presented itself to the shrewd mind of Bishop Warburton, and thus expressed in his introduction to Julian:

"The authority of the Fathers had for many ages been esteemed *sacred*. These men, by taking the Greek philosophers to their assistance, in explaining the nature and genius of the Gospel, had unhappily turned religion into an *art;* and their successors the schoolmen, by framing a body of theology out of them, instead of searching for it in the Scriptures, soon after turned it into a *trade*. But (as in all affairs where reason does not hold the balance) that which had been extravagantly advanced, was, on the turn of the times, as extravagantly undervalued. It may not therefore be amiss to acquaint the English reader, in few words, how this came to pass.

"When the avarice and ambition of the Romish Clergy had, by working with the superstition and ignorance of the people, erected what they call their hierarchy, and digested an ecclesiastical policy on the ruins of Gospel liberty, for the administration of it, they found nothing of such use for the support of this lordly system as the making the authority of the Fathers sacred and decisive. For having introduced

numerous errors and superstitions both in rites and doctrine, which the *silence* and the *declaration* of Scripture equally condemned, they were obliged to seal up those living oracles, and open this new warehouse of the dead. And it was no wonder if in that shoal of writers (as a poet of our own calls it) which the great drag-net of time hath inclosed, and brought down to us, under the name of *Fathers*, there should be some amongst them of a character suited to countenance any kind of folly or extravagance. The decisions of the *Fathers*, therefore, they thought fit to treat as laws, and to collect them into a kind of code, under the title of the *Sentences*.

"From this time every thing was tried at the bar of the Fathers; and so unquestioned was their jurisdiction, that when the great defection was made from the Church of Rome back again to the Church of Christ, the reformed, though they shook off the tyranny of the Pope, could not disengage themselves from the unbounded authority of the Fathers; but carried that prejudice with them, as they did some others of a worse complexion, into the Protestant religion. For in sacred matters, as novelty is suspicious, and antiquity venerable, they thought it for their credit to have the Fathers on their side. They seemed neither to consider antiquity in general as a thing relative, nor Christian antiquity as a thing positive: either of which would have shewn them that the Fathers themselves were modern, compared to that authority on which the Reformation was founded; and that the Gospel was that true antiquity on which all its followers should repose themselves. The consequence of which unhappy error was, that, in the long appeal to reason, between Protestants and Papists, both of them going on a common principle, of the decisive authority of the Fathers, enabled the latter to support their credit against all the evidence of common sense and sacred Scripture.

"At length an excellent writer of the *Reformed*, observing that the controversy was likely to be endless; for though the gross corruptions of Popery were certainly later than the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, to which the appeal was usually made, yet the seeds of them being then sown, and beginning to pullulate, it was but too plain there was hold enough for a skilful debater to draw the *Fathers* to his own side, and make them water the sprouts they had been planting: observing this, I say, he wisely projected to shift the ground, and force the disputants to vary their method, both of attack and defence. In order to this he composed a discourse of the *True Use of the Fathers;* in which, with uncommon learning and strength of argument, he shewed that the Fathers were incompetent deciders of the controversies now on foot; since the points in question were not formed into articles till long after

the ages in which they lived. This was bringing the *Fathers* from the bench to the table; degrading them from the rank of judges into the class of simple evidence; in which, too, they were not to speak, like *Irish* evidence, in every cause where they were wanted, but only to such matters as were agreed to be within their knowledge. Had this learned critic stopped here, his book had been free from blame; but at the same time his purpose had in all likelihood proved very ineffectual; for the obliquity of old prejudices is not to be set straight by reducing it to that line of right which barely restores it to integrity. He went much further: and by shewing, occasionally, that they were absurd interpreters of holy writ; that they were bad reasoners in morals, and very loose evidence in facts; he seemed willing to have his reader infer, that even though they had been masters of the subject, yet these other defects would have rendered them very unqualified deciders."

But it is not my object, nor my wont, to depreciate the testimony of the early Fathers and martyrs, whose noble defence of the Christian faith, whether by their pens or by their lives, is beyond all praise. To them we owe a debt of gratitude, which we cannot, perhaps, well comprehend, much less repay. We are ever ready to yield deference, when we cannot recognise authority, and are glad to know their pious and learned thoughts, though we may not bow to them as divine. It was the abuse of the Fathers which led to the questioning of even their use. The English Church has, however, wisely crushed the former, while she sets her seal of approbation upon the latter.

It seems to me that I cannot conclude this branch of my subject better than by producing the opinions of one or two universally-acknowledged sound divines of the Reformed Church. Jeremy Taylor and Richard Hooker are names which will be held in reverence as long as the theology of the Church of England is valued—of neither of whom can it be said that he over-estimated the Bible or undervalued the Fathers. Views such as theirs would keep us at once from yielding too much to other men's opinions, or having too great confidence in our own. The *via media* is the way of the Church of England.

Jeremy Taylor, in his "Liberty of Prophesying," says as follows:

"There are some that think they can determine all questions in the world by two or three sayings of the fathers, or by the consent of so many as they will please to call a concurrent testimony: but this consideration will soon be at an end. For if the fathers, when they are witnesses of tradition, do not always speak truth, as it happened in the case of Papias, and his numerous followers for almost three ages together; then is their testimony more improbable, when they dispute or write commentaries.

"The fathers of the first ages spake unitedly concerning divers questions of secret theology, and yet were afterward contradicted by one personage of great reputation, whose credit had so much influence upon the world, as to make the contrary opinion become popular: why then may not we have the same liberty, when so plain an uncertainty is in their persuasions, and so great contrariety in their doctrines? But this is evident in the case of absolute predestination, which till St. Austin's time no man preached, but all taught the contrary; and yet the reputation of this one excellent man altered the scene. But if he might dissent from so general a doctrine, why may not we do so too (it being pretended that he is so excellent a precedent to be followed), if we have the same reason? He had no more authority nor dispensation to dissent than any bishop hath now. And therefore, St. Austin hath dealt ingenuously; and as he took this liberty to himself, so he denies it not to others, but indeed forces them to preserve their own liberty. And therefore, when St. Jerome had a great mind to follow the fathers in a point that he fancied, and the best security he had was, 'Patiaris me cum talibus errare,' St. Austin would not endure it, but answered his reason, and neglected the authority."

* * * * * * *

"If I should reckon all the particular reasons against the certainty of this topic, it would be more than needs as to this question, and therefore I will abstain from all disparagement of those worthy personages, who were excellent lights to their several diocesses and cures. And therefore I will not instance that Clemens Alexandrinus* taught that Christ felt no hunger or thirst, but ate only to make demonstration of the verity of his human nature; nor that St. Hilary taught that Christ, in his sufferings, had no sorrow; nor that Origen taught the pains of hell not to have an eternal duration; nor that St. Cyprian taught rebaptization; nor that Athenagoras condemned second marriages; nor that St. John Damascenus said Christ only prayed in appearance, not really and in truth: I will let them all rest in peace,

* Strom. l. 3, et 6.

and their memories in honour: for if I should inquire into the particular probations of this article, I must do to them as I should be forced to do now; if any man should say, that the writings of the schoolmen were excellent argument and authority to determine men's persuasions, I must consider their writings, and observe their defaillances, their contradictions, the weakness of their arguments, the misallegations of Scripture, their inconsequent deductions, their false opinions, and all the weaknesses of humanity, and the failings of their persons; which no good man is willing to do, unless he be compelled to it by a pretence that they are infallible; or that they are followed by men even into errors or impiety. And therefore, since there is enough in the former instances to cure any such mispersuasion and prejudice, I will not instance in the innumerable particularities, that might persuade us to keep our liberty entire, or to use it discreetly. For it is not to be denied but that great advantages are to be made by their writings, 'et probabile est, quod omnibus, quod pluribus, quod sapientibus videtur:' If one wise man says a thing, it is an argument to me to believe it in its degree of probation, that is, proportionable to such an assent as the authority of a wise man can produce, and when there is nothing against it that is greater; and so in proportion higher and higher, as more wise men (such as the old doctors were) do affirm it. But that which I complain of is, that we look upon wise men that lived long ago, with so much veneration and mistake, that we reverence them, not for having been wise men, but that they lived long since. But when the question is concerning authority, there must be something to build it on; a divine commandment, human sanction, excellency of spirit, and greatness of understanding, on which things all human authority is regularly built. But now if we had lived in their times (for so we must look upon them now, as they did who without prejudice beheld them), I suppose we should then have beheld them, as we in England look on those prelates who are of great reputation for learning and sanctity: here only is the difference; when persons are living, their authority is depressed by their personal defaillances, and the contrary interests of their contemporaries, which disband when they are dead, and leave their credit entire upon the reputation of those excellent books and monuments of learning and piety which are left behind. But beyond this, why the bishop of Hippo shall have greater authority than the bishop of the Canaries, 'cæteris paribus,' I understand not. For did they, that lived (to instance) in St. Austin's time, believe all that he wrote? If they did, they were much to blame; or else himself was to blame for retracting much of it a little before his death. And if while he lived, his affirmative was no more authority than derives from the

credit of one very wise man, against whom also very wise men were opposed, I know not why his authority should prevail farther now; for there is nothing added to the strength of his reason since that time, but only that he hath been in great esteem with posterity. And if that be all, why the opinion of the following ages shall be of more force than the opinion of the first ages, against whom St. Austin, in many things, clearly did oppose himself, I see no reason. Or whether the first ages were against him or no, yet that he is approved by the following ages, is no better argument; for it makes his authority not be innate, but derived from the opinion of others, and so to be 'precaria,' and to depend upon others, who if they should change their opinions (and such examples there have been many,) then there were nothing left to urge our consent to him, which when it was at the best was only this, because he had the good fortune to be believed by them that came after, he must be so still: and because it was no argument for the old doctors before him, this will not be very good in his behalf. The same I say of any company of them, I say not so of all of them, it is to no purpose to say it; for there is no question this day in contestation, in the explication of which all the old writers did consent. In the assignation of the canon of Scripture, they never did consent for six hundred years together; and then, by that time, the bishops had agreed indifferently well, and but indifferently, upon that,—they fell out in twenty more: and except it be in the Apostles' creed, and articles of such nature, there is nothing which may with any colour be called a consent, much less tradition universal."—*Taylor's Lib. of Prop., Sec.* viii., 1, 2, 3.

Hooker's testimony, in the middle of an argument to shew the value of Patristical writings, runs thus:

"I grant that proof derived from the authority of man's judgment is not able to work that assurance which doth grow by a stronger proof; and therefore, although ten thousand general councils would set down one and the same definitive sentence concerning any point of religion whatsoever, yet one demonstrative reason alleged, or one manifest testimony cited from the mouth of God himself to the contrary, could not choose but overweigh them all; inasmuch as for them to have been deceived it is not impossible; it is, that demonstrative reason or testimony divine should deceive. Howbeit in defect of proof infallible, because the mind doth rather follow probable persuasions than approve the things that have in them no likelihood of truth at all; surely if a question concerning matter of doctrine were proposed, and on the one

side no kind of proof appearing, there should on the other be alleged and shewed that so a number of the learnedest divines in the world have ever thought; although it did not appear what reason or what Scripture led them to be of that judgment, yet to their very bare judgment somewhat a reasonable man would attribute, notwithstanding the common imbecilities which are incident into our nature."—*Hooker's Eccl. Pol., Bk.* ii., *ch.* vii. 5.

Having thus settled the true use of the Fathers, we must receive them as invaluable witnesses of matters of fact, and living examples of the modes of thought and expression which prevailed in their day in things appertaining to the Christian religion. Without, therefore, always agreeing with their views, or even acknowledging the wisdom or judiciousness of them, we can *consider* what they propound to us. If we are told that their views were in a particular direction, we may examine their works to satisfy ourselves as to whether the statement is true, without acknowledging ourselves bound to accept what they held, nor in adducing proofs to the contrary, should we be acting in opposition to our own principles; for we should not insist on the adoption by others of what we adduce from the Fathers, *because* it was to be found in them. It would no doubt be a great satisfaction to find our Church at one with the churches of the earlier ages in faith and practice, and this phase of the "communion of saints" it is ours thankfully to enjoy.

CHAPTER II.

CONSECRATION, AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST, NOT ESSENTIALLY DIFFERENT FROM CONSECRATION WHEN USED IN OTHER CASES.

Archdeacon Wilberforce opens his book with the satisfactory declaration that "an enquiry into the nature of the Holy Eucharist must be founded upon Scripture, and upon that passage of Scripture by which the solemn rite was authorized as well as explained." And after quoting the few simple words of the Evangelists as to the institution, he proceeds to say:

"Our Lord's words (this is my body) involve this main truth—that consecration is the essential characteristic of the Holy Eucharist. For our Lord does not speak of bread at large, or wine in general, but of *This, i. e.*, of that which was consecrated, or set apart. No doubt His words had a further application; their ultimate reference was to 'the inward part or thing signified,' which was the real object under consideration; but they had also an *indirect* relation to 'the outward and visible sign.' Now viewing the thing in reference to this last, it was the bread which He had blessed, over which He had given thanks, and which He had broken; and the cup over which He had given thanks; which were the subject-matter of His declaration. The consecration, therefore, by which these elements were separated from all co-ordinate specimens of the same material, is that circumstance which gives them the peculiar character which His words express. And so we may learn also from the only other passage of Holy Scripture in which this subject is formally treated. When St. Paul explains the nature of the Holy Eucharist to the Corinthians, he refers to the consecration of the elements as its distinguishing characteristic. 'The *cup of blessing which we bless*, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? The *bread which we break*, is it not the communion of the Body

of Christ?' We may infer, therefore, that the elements, as consecrated, are the subject spoken of: Our Lord's awful words do not refer to bread and wine at large, but to that which He held in His hands, and which He had blessed."—*Doct. H. Euch. pp.* 7, 8.

Now, in the whole of this extract, although I feel that the idea intended to be expressed by the Archdeacon is wholly beyond and at variance with my own, yet there is but one sentence from which I would dissent. That sentence is, "No doubt His words had a further application; their ultimate reference was to 'the inward part or thing signified,' which was the real object under consideration; but they had also an *indirect* relation to 'the outward and visible sign.'" The rest is all expressive of sound Scriptural, Protestant doctrine, and in unobjectionable phraseology; and it was because it was felt not to go far enough in conveying the erroneous idea of transubstantiation, or whatever else the Archdeacon would call it,—(I shall use this word, which he does not repudiate, for want of a better),—that he put in that unwarrantable sentence.

It is hardly to be supposed that any person could be found to assert that, when our blessed Lord said "this," as he handed the bread to his disciples, he meant *all* bread, and not exclusively the piece which he then held. I never yet met with any individual who contended for any real or virtual connection between bread as bread (*i.e.* bread in general) and our Lord's body, between wine as wine (*i.e.* wine in general) and his precious blood. No doubt it is the consecration (*i.e.* the separation of a given portion by prayer to a sacred use) which constitutes the bread and the wine, in a sense, holy, and typical of those saving realities, the names of which they sometimes bear. "The consecration, by which these elements were separated from all other co-ordinate specimens of the same material, is that circumstance which gives them the peculiar character which our Lord's words express." His "awful words do not refer to bread and wine at large, but to that which he held in his hands, and which he had blessed."

In exact accordance with this idea are the quotations from the Fathers, made by the Archdeacon. It is "the food which is sanctified by the word of prayer," which is "no longer common bread and common drink," but "the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus,"* according to the figurative mode of speaking, common amongst orientals and generally adopted by the early Fathers, when they refer to the physical things used in the ordinances of religious worship. It is when "the bread from the earth receives the invocation of God," that it is "no longer common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly."† Augustin well says:

"'Our bread and our cup is not any one,' *i.e.* any specimen of the food partaken, 'but it is a mystical one, which is produced by a fixed consecration, and does not come by growth. That which is not produced in this way, though it may be bread and a cup, is a means of bodily refreshment, not a sacrament of religion.'‡ 'Before the blessing of the sacred words another species is named; after consecration the Body is signified.' Before consecration it is called a different thing; after consecration it is called Blood."§

We are free to confess that we have no other idea than that which is so properly expressed in these quotations—viz., that it is the prayer which is offered over the physical elements which gives them their religious significance. Without this they would have remained "common;" by means of this they become in a sense "holy."

But on what ground can it be asserted that the word *this* refers not to the bread, visible and tangible, which was extended to the disciples, in its primary and direct application, but that it only made an *indirect* allusion to it? Nay; with what consistency can such an assertion be made by the Archdeacon, when he himself, but a moment before, had logically divided the expression "this is my body" into a subject (this), copula (is), and predicate (my body)? "This gives us," he says, "three topics,

* Just. Mart. Apol. i. 66. † Iren iv., 18, 5. ‡ S. Aug. Con. Faus. xx. 13.
§ S. Amb. de Myst. ix. 54.

which must be considered in order;" "Our Lord does not speak of bread at large, or wine in general, but of *this, i.e.* of that which was consecrated, or set apart." Yet no sooner are these rational words committed to paper,—no sooner have these Scriptural and Protestant principles been enunciated, than it is added "*No doubt* their ultimate reference was to the inward part or thing signified, they had an *indirect* relation to the 'outward and visible sign.'" It is difficult here to tell which most to wonder at, the all but total abandonment of the foregoing logical division of the sentence, or the cool assumption of the whole question in dispute. That *no doubt* is an instance of the excessive jealousy with which we should read tractarian books. So far from there being *no doubt*, there is *every doubt*, and in fact the fullest demonstration, that the word *this* had no such ultimate reference, but had a natural and *direct* application to what our Lord held in his hand. That such is the case has been shewn in some degree by the remarks and quotations just made, and will be, I hesitate not to say, most fully demonstrated when I come to that part of the subject,—viz, to shew the *true* doctrine of the second Sacrament. Let it, however, be here specially noted, with what perfect coolness an assumption can be made, which, by taking for granted,—yes, as even beyond a doubt,—the whole subject of the controversy, settles it, and without one argument on the side of the tractarians and Papists, against, as I believe, reason, Protestantism, and Scriptural truth.

But while agreeing with the Scriptural and Catholic principle, that it is the prayer which gives the religious significance to the corporeal emblems in the Eucharistic supper, it cannot be too emphatically reprobated that the prayer used in this case has a different effect, or that the significance is of a deeper or more real nature, than in any other rite of our holy religion. There is not a word in Scripture to lead us to imagine any thing of the sort; nor is the testimony of divines, either ancient or modern (always excepting the advocates of Romanism), in any, the smallest degree, tending in this direction.

It is, perhaps, not too much to assert that the Bible says nothing whatever as to the consecration of the water in baptism. The expression of the Apostle Paul, "that he might sanctify and cleanse it (the Church), with the washing of water *by the word*," (*Eph.* v. 26,) is ambiguous; and while the last three words may refer to the prayer of consecration, they may also, as probably they do, refer to the influence of the gospel preached.

Where, therefore, there is nothing on either side in the pages of inspiration, we may enquire what the early Church thought upon the matter. And herein the testimony of the Fathers is so emphatic and numerous, that the wonder is that any person should have had the temerity to hazard an assertion to the contrary. I give the following extracts from Bingham (with the authorities), in his own words, rather than incorporate them with any sentences of my own, for this reason chiefly—viz., that it may be felt, as Bingham did not write for the purpose of directly controverting any opponent, his testimony is the more valuable and not to be suspected. As far as I have had opportunity, I have considered his authorities for myself, and verified his references. The result of this, on my own mind, is fully to coincide with his conclusions, to adopt the sentiments which he has expressed as my own, and, in direct antagonism to Archdeacon Wilberforce, to assert that the Fathers of the early Christian Church did not believe the effects of consecration in the Eucharist as at all different from those produced by prayers of consecration when used in baptism, or in any other religious rite:

"Immediately after the unction the minister proceeded to consecrate the water, or the bishop, if he were present, consecrated it, while the priests were finishing the unction. For so the author under the name of Dionysius represents it. While the priests, says he,* are finishing the unction, the bishop comes to the mother of adoption, so he calls the font, and by invocation sanctifies the water in it, thrice pouring in some of the holy chrism in a manner representing the sign of the cross. This invocation or consecration of the water by prayer, is

* Dionys. de Hierarch. Eccle. cap. 2. p. 253.

mentioned by Tertullian; for he says,* The waters are made the sacrament of sanctification by invocation of God. The Spirit immediately descends from heaven, and resting upon them sanctifies them by himself, and they, being so sanctified, imbibe the power of sanctifying. And Cyprian† declares, That the water must first be cleansed and sanctified by the priest, that it may have power by baptism to wash away the sins of man. And so the whole council of Carthage,‡ in the time of Cyprian, says, The water is sanctified by the prayer of the priest to wash away sin. St. Austin often mentions this invocation in his books of baptism. That water§ is not profane and adulterated, over which the name of God is invoked, though the invocation be made by profane and adulterous men. In another place‖ he says, This invocation was used both in consecrating the waters of baptism, and the oil for unction, and the Eucharist, and in giving imposition of hands. And the sacraments were valid, though it were a sinner or a murderer that made the prayer. And again, answering the objection of the Cyprianists and Donatists, that a wicked man or a heretic could not sanctify the water, he says, Every error¶ in the prayer of consecration does not destroy the essence of baptism, but only the want of those evangelical words (he means the form of baptizing in the name of the Trinity) instituted by Christ, without which baptism cannot be consecrated. For otherwise, if the water were not consecrated when the minister uses any erroneous words in his prayer, then not only wicked men, but many good brethren, in the Church, did not sanctify the water; for many of their prayers were daily corrected, when they were rehearsed to those that were more learned, and many errors were found in them contrary to the Catholic faith. Yet they that were baptized when such prayers were said over the water, were not baptized again. This is a plain evidence, that prayers of consecration were then generally used both among the Catholics and Donatists, though neither the use nor the orthodoxy of them were reckoned to be of absolute necessity to the very being and essence of baptism, which might consist with great errors in such prayers.

"Thirdly, I observe concerning the effects of this consecration, that the very same change was supposed to be wrought by it in the waters of baptism, as by the consecration of bread and wine in the Eucharist. For they supposed not only the presence of the Spirit, but also the mystical presence of Christ's blood to be here after consecration. Julius

* Tertul. de Bapt. cap. 4.
† Cyprian. Ep. 70. ad Januar. p. 190.
‡ Conc. Carthag. ap. Cypr. p. 233.
§ Aug. de Bapt. lib. 3. cap. 10.
‖ Id. de Bapt. lib. 5. cap. 20.
¶ Aug. de Bapt. lib. 6. cap. 25.

Firmicus,* speaking of baptism, bids men here seek for the pure waters, the undefiled fountain, where the blood of Christ, after many spots and defilements, would whiten them by the Holy Ghost. Gregory Nazianzen† and Basil‡ say upon this account, That a greater than the temple, a greater than Solomon, a greater than Jonas is here, meaning Christ, by his mystical presence and the power of his blood. St. Austin§ says, Baptism or the baptismal water is red, when once it is consecrated by the blood of Christ; and this was prefigured by the waters of the Red Sea. Prosper‖ is bold to say, That in baptism we are dipped in blood; and therefore martyrs are twice dipped in blood, first in the blood of Christ at baptism, and then in their own blood at martyrdom. St. Jerome¶ uses the same bold metaphor, explaining those words of Isaiah, 'Wash ye, make ye clean:' Be ye baptized in my blood by the laver of regeneration. And again,** speaking of the Ethiopian eunuch, he says, He was baptized in the blood of Christ, about whom he was reading. After the same manner, Cæsarius says,†† The soul goes into the living waters, consecrated and made red by the blood of Christ. And Isidore‡‡ says, What is the red sea, but baptism consecrated in the blood of Christ? Others tell us, that we are hereby made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, and eat his flesh, according to what is said in St. John's Gospel, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.' Upon which words Fulgentius§§ founds the necessity of baptism: Forasmuch as it may be perceived by any considering man, that the flesh of Christ is eaten and his blood drunk in the laver of regeneration. Hence Cyril of Alexandria says,‖‖ We are partakers of the spiritual Lamb in baptism. And Chrysostom,¶¶ That we thereby put on Christ, not only his Divinity, nor only his humanity, that is, his flesh, but both together. And Nazianzen,*** That in baptism we are anointed and protected by the precious blood of Christ, as Israel was by the blood upon the door posts in the night. St. Chrysostom††† says again, That they are baptized, put on a royal garment, a purple dipped in the blood of the Lord. Philo-Carpathius says, The spouse of Christ, his Church,

* Firmic. de Error. Profan. Relig. c. 28. † Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 657.
‡ Basil. de Bapt. lib. 1. c. 2. t. 1. p. 558. § Aug. Tract. 11. in Joh. p. 41.
‖ Prosper. de Promissis. lib. 2. cap. 2. ¶ Hieron. in Esai. i. 16.
** Id. in Esai. liii. 7. †† Cæsar. Arelatens. Hom. 6 de Paschat. Bibl. Patr. t. 2. p. 276.
‡‡ Isidor. Hispal. in Exod. xix. §§ Fulgent. de Bapt. Æthiop. cap. 11. p. 611.
‖‖ Cyril. in Exod. xii. lib 2. t. 1. p. 270.
¶¶ Chrys. Serm. 27. de Cruce, t. 6. p. 293. *** Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 646.
††† Chrys. Hom. 60. ad Illuminandos, t. 1. p. 796.

receives in baptism the seal* of Christ, being washed in the fountain of his most holy blood. Optatus,† as we have heard before, says, Christ comes down by the invocation, and joins himself to the waters of baptism. Nay, Chrysostom,‡ in one of his bold rhetorical flights, scruples not to tell a man that is baptized, that he immediately embraces his Lord in his arms, that he is united to his body, nay, compounded or consubstantiated with that body which sits above, whither the devil has no access. Some tell us, as Isidore, that the water of baptism is the water§ that flowed out of Christ's side at his passion: and others, as Laurentius Novariensis,|| that it is water mixed with the sacred blood of the Son of God. Others tell us,¶ that the water is transmuted or changed in its nature by the Holy Ghost, to a sort of Divine and ineffable power. So Cyril of Alexandria, who frequently uses the word *μεταστοιχείωσις*, transelementation, both when he speaks of the water in baptism, and the bread and wine in the Eucharist, or of any other changes that are wrought in the mysteries of the Christian religion. Cyril of Jerusalem, and Gregory Nyssen have the same observation upon the change that is wrought in the oil, after consecration, which they make to be the same with that of the bread and wine in the Eucharist. Beware, says Cyril,** that you take not this ointment to be bare ointment. For as the bread in the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is not mere bread, but the body of Christ; so this holy ointment, after invocation, is not bare or common ointment, but it is a gift of God that makes Christ and the Holy Spirit to be present in the action. In like manner, Gregory Nyssen makes the same change to be in the mystical oil, and in the altar itself, and in the ministers by ordination, and in the waters of baptism, as in the bread and wine in the Eucharist after consecration. Do not contemn, says he, the Divine laver, nor despise it as a common thing, because of the use†† of water. For great and wonderful things are wrought by it. This altar, before which we stand, is but common stone in its own nature, differing nothing from other stones, wherewith our walls are built; but after it is consecrated to the service of God, and has received a benediction, is is a holy table, an immaculate altar, not to be touched by any but the priests, and that with the greatest reverence. The bread also is at first but common bread, but when

* Philo. in Cantic. iv. 12. † Optat. lib. 3. p. 62.
‡ Chrys. Hom. 6. in. Colos. p. 1359. § Isidor. de Offic. Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 24.
|| Laurent. Novar. Hom. 1. de Pœnitentia. Bibl. Patr. t. 2. p. 127.
¶ Cyril. in Joh. iii. 5. p. 147. ** Cyril. Catech. Myst. 3. n. 3.
†† Nyssen de Baptismo Christi, t. 3. p. 369.

once it is sanctified by the holy mystery, it is made and called the body of Christ. So the mystical oil, and so the wine, though they be things of little value before the benediction, yet, after their sanctification by the Spirit, they both of them work wonders. The same power of the word makes a priest become honourable and venerable, when he is separated from the community of the vulgar by a new benediction. For he who before was only one of the common people, is now immediately made a ruler and president, a teacher of piety, and a minister of the secret mysteries: and all these things he does without any change in his body or shape; for to all outward appearance he is the same that he was, but the change is in his invisible soul, by an invisible power and grace. Pope Leo* goes one step further, and tells us, that baptism makes a change not only in the water, but in the man that receives it; for thereby Christ receives him, and he receives Christ, and he is not the same after baptism that he was before, but the body of him that is regenerated is made the flesh of him that was crucified. From all which it is easy to observe, that in all these cases, the change which they speak of is not made in the substance of the things, but in the qualities only; the water is not the blood of Christ substantially and really, but only symbolically and mystically; nor is a man changed into the flesh of Christ thereby any other way, than as he is made a living member of his mystical body, participating of that Spirit whereby he rules and governs his church, as the Head of it. So that when the ancients speak of a Divine change or transelementation (for as yet the word transubstantiation was not known) in the bread and wine in the Eucharist, they are to be interpreted, as here we do in baptism, of a change in qualities and powers, and not in substance; since all the words they used to express that change, are equally verified in the waters of baptism after consecration."—*Bingham on Consec. in Bapt. book* xi. *c.* 10, *s.* 1—4.

Now, after this clear and consistent testimony, what are we to say of the distinction attempted to be made by the Archdeacon? It is manifest that it has no foundation in Scripture, and has no sanction from the writings of the early Christian Fathers. The standard divines of our own Church, as far as they touch upon the subject, speak the same language as those of primitive times; so that Mr. Archdeacon Wilberfore is left in solitary dignity, save in so far as support may be drawn for his teaching from heretical

* Leo, Serm. 14. de Passione, p. 62.

sources,—such, that is, as regard neither the Bible nor primitive Christianity in their attempt to build up a system of priestcraft, which makes those who ought to be "ministers" and our "servants for Christ's sake," "lords over God's heritage," if not wolves to the flock.

I cannot here omit to notice, how unsatisfactory any doctrinal conclusion must be which should be drawn from the names and titles given by the Fathers to the elements used in the ordinances of religion. It is manifest that they followed not only where sound reason and judgment led in this matter, but also where the most unlimited fancy invited. It must not be supposed that the Fathers are censurable for this: they spoke in like manner of everything in which they were concerned. It is, however, absolutely necessary for us to be able to distinguish between the conclusions of sober and enlightened judgment and the bold flights of oriental imagination. In respecting the former, the Fathers of the English Church in the sixteenth century brought back the Church to the Scriptural model as we now have it; while the divines of the Romish communion, by following the latter, have fallen into such heresies as totally eclipse the sun of righteousness, and virtually excluding Christ and his finished work from His own revealed religion.

But another proof that the consecration of the Eucharistic bread and wine is a consecration *sui generis*, is given by the Archdeacon in the following imaginary distinction between the two sacraments. This distinction he fully sets out as follows:

"It will throw further light upon this subject, if we compare the Holy Eucharist with that, which in many respects possesses a corresponding character—the sacrament of baptism. Both of these ordinances were instituted by Christ Himself; and both have an immediate connexion with those blessings, which he bestows upon His mystical Body. In both there is an inward grace and an outward sign. In both the union of form and matter is necessary to the completeness of that which is outward and visible. But in baptism the inward part consists only of the benefit bestowed, whereas in the Holy Eucharist, as our catechism reminds us, the thing signified is distinct from the

benefit by which it is attended. Baptism, that is, implies two parts only, the outward symbol, and the inward gift; but the Holy Eucharist implies three — the outward sign, the inward part or thing signified, and the accompanying blessing. In baptism, therefore, the outward sign has no permanent relation to the inward grace, since the rite has no existence save in the act of administration; but in the Holy Eucharist the outward sign has something more than a momentary connexion with the thing signified. As respects baptism, therefore, Our Lord used no words which imply that any particular portion of the element employed is invested with a specific character: it was not *this* water, but the element at large which was sanctified to be a pledge of the "mystical washing away of sin." And the Church has always acted upon this principle. It is orderly and decent that the water should be set apart with prayer, and that the ceremony should be performed by Christ's minister; but the absence of these conditions does not invalidate the act, either according to the belief of the ancient Church, or according to the existing law of the Church of England. For the setting apart of the element confers only a relative holiness; it is not necessary to the validity of the sacrament; the inward grace is associated with the act, and not with the element; and does not require that the outward part should be brought into an abiding relation with any inward part or thing signified. And for the same reason, the intervention of the minister, however desirable, is not essential. A deacon, in the priest's absence, is as much authorized to baptize as a priest. No doubt it might have pleased God to assign the same limitations in the case of baptism which obtained in regard to the Holy Eucharist; but such limitations are not expressed in Scripture, nor has the thing been so understood by the Church. The priestly office, indeed, is essential to the validity of baptism, because without it there can exist no living branch of Christ's Church, into which new members may be engrafted; but its relation to this sacrament is general, and not specific, because baptism depends upon an act which all Christians may perform, and not upon any consecration which requires a special commission.

"Now the reverse of all these things is true of the Holy Eucharist. Here it is not the element at large which is spoken of, but *this bread*, and *this cup*. The intervention of the minister is not matter of decent ceremonial; it is essential to the validity of the ordinance. For valid baptism is that which is ministered to a competent receiver, but a valid Eucharist is that which is received after consecration by an authorized priest. It is obvious, then, that consecration is the essential characteristic of this sacrament, since, but for it, the inward part and the

outward part cannot be brought together. And this fact is testified by that law of our Church, which renders the services of the priest indispensible in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, as it was testified by the practice and assertions of antiquity."—*Doct. of H. Euch. pp.* 13—15.

Now in this extract there are two things which specially claim our attention. It is asserted—(1.) "That baptism implies *two* parts only—the outward symbol and the inward gift; but the Holy Eucharist implies *three*—the outward sign, the inward part or thing signified, and the accompanying blessing." (2.) That "it is orderly and decent that the water should be set apart with prayer, and that the ceremony should be performed by Christ's minister; but the absence of these conditions does not invalidate the act, either according to the belief of the ancient Church, or according to the existing law of the Church of England;" but in the Holy Eucharist, "the intervention of the minister is not matter of decent ceremonial; it is essential to the validity of the ordinance." We will proceed to inquire, what foundation there is for these distinctions in Scripture and in the writings of divines, ancient and modern, when, if I mistake not, we shall find that they are purely imaginary; having no authority but that of the Church of Rome, while they are wholly inconsistent with Scripture and the recorded opinions of the first theologians of the early and the later churches.

CHAPTER III.

THERE IS NO ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO SACRAMENTS, BAPTISM AND THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

"How many parts are there in a sacrament? Two: the outward visible sign and the inward spiritual grace." Such is the instruction which the Church of England gives to her children, as consonant with and derived from Scripture. She, at all events, makes no such distinction as that which we have alluded to—*i.e.*, that baptism has two parts and the Eucharist three. But as we are not required by the Church of which we are members, to believe anything but what Scripture warrants, we will turn our attention to the foundation of her teaching, and judge for ourselves whether or not we are furnished with instruction, consistent with the word of God.

Let me bespeak the reader's steady attention to the following passages. They are a selection of those which mention, *in combination*, the "outward and visible sign" and "the inward part or thing signified" in baptism. The relation is both apposite and natural:—"I indeed baptise you with *water* unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the *Holy Ghost* and with *fire;*" "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the *water;* and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the *Spirit of God* descending like a dove, and lighting upon him."—(*Matt.* iii., 11, 16.)* "He that sent me to baptize with *water*, the same said unto me, Upon whom

* See also Mark i., 8; Luke iii., 16.

thou shalt see the *Spirit* descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the *Holy Ghost;*" "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of *water* and of the *Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."—(*John* i., 33; iii., 5.) "For John truly baptized with *water;* but ye shall be baptized with the *Holy Ghost* not many days hence;" "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the *Holy Ghost;*" "Can any man forbid *water*, that these should not be baptized, which have received the *Holy Ghost* as well as we?"—(*Acts* i., 5; ii., 38; x., 47.) "For by one *Spirit* are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one *Spirit.*"—(1 *Cor.* xii., 13.) "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the *washing* of regeneration, and renewing of the *Holy Ghost.*"*—(*Titus* iii., 5.)

Now what, I would ask with confidence, must be the conviction of any candid person on reading these passages? Is it not that the Holy Spirit is the thing signified by the water, and that, as the water cleanseth the body, so the Holy Spirit sanctifieth the soul? If Scripture be allowed to decide the controversy as to whether or not there is a real inward part or thing signified in baptism, there can be no doubt of the verdict. It is clear, frequent, and unvarying. If any man cannot *see* this, it appears to me he must be possessed of great mental obtuseness; if he sees, and refuses to acknowledge, or, still worse, to misrepresent it, he must be the subject of great moral obliquity.

There is another class of passages to which it may be well here to refer, which, teaching the same doctrine under variety, strongly confirm the views stated more directly in those above given:— "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: Who, when they were come down, prayed for them,

* See Appendix A.

that they might receive the *Holy Ghost:* For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the *Holy Ghost.*" "And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the *Holy Ghost* since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any *Holy Ghost.* And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the *Holy Ghost* came on them."—(*Acts* viii., 14—17; xix., 1—6.)

Now, whatever difficulty there may be in explaining the difference between John's baptism and Christian baptism, or even that in the former of the above quotations and the ordinary one in the name of the Trinity, there is no question of this, that they were both considered defective in not having secured to their recipients the gift of the Holy Spirit, whether in his ordinary or extraordinary influences. This defect led in the two divinely-recorded cases to the imposition of hands by the Apostles for the supply of that which was wanting, and in each case the means proved effectual. I need scarcely say, that these are two of the passages upon which is built "the doctrine of laying on of hands," or confirmation, a rite placed next to that of baptism by St. Paul (*Heb.* vi., 2), and which he enumerates as among the first "principles of the doctrine of Christ." It was passages such as these which led the ancient Church to consider confirmation as a necessary part of even baptism itself, and caused them to administer it *immediately* after the sacramental rite. And that the early Fathers considered the Holy Spirit the thing signified in baptism, and that they administered the rite of confirmation to render the sacrament complete, I will adduce a few passages to shew:

"But it will be sufficient to have briefly premised these things, among which is also recognised that first notice of baptism, whereby even at that time it was, by the very posture, fore-signified as a figure of baptism, that *the Spirit of God*, Which, *in the beginning, was borne above the waters*, will still abide upon the waters as the baptizer. But an *Holy Thing* was surely borne above an holy, or that which bore borrowed holiness from that which was borne above it; since every substance lying beneath must needs catch the quality of that which lieth above: specially the bodily that of the spiritual, which, by the subtlety of its own nature, can easily penetrate and sink into it. Thus the nature of water sanctified by the Holy One, itself also received the power of sanctifying." "Wherefore all waters, from the ancient privilege of their origin, obtain, after prayer to God, the sacrament of sanctification. For the Spirit straightway cometh down from the heavens above, and is over the waters, sanctifying them from Himself; and so sanctified they imbibe the power of sanctifying."*

"Not that we obtain the Holy Spirit† in the water, but being cleansed in the water, under the Angel, we are prepared for the Holy Spirit. Here also hath a figure gone before. For thus was John aforetime the forerunner of the Lord, 'preparing His way:' and so also for the Holy Spirit, about to come upon us, doth the Angel, the witness of Baptism, 'make the paths straight,' by the washing away of sins, which Faith obtaineth, being sealed 'in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost.'"‡

"A symbol of the Spirit is in it, yea a type of the Holy Spirit, who is mingled in water that it may become a propitiation, and is blended with bread that it may become a Sacrifice." "Lo! Fire and Spirit in that river wherein Thou wert baptized, Fire and Spirit in our baptism."§

* Tertul. de Bapt. sec. 4.

† *i.e.* not fully; His complete gifts being bestowed through the Anointing c. 7, and imposition of hands as part of Baptism (see Scriptural Views, p. 153, note). For since Tertullian (with all other Fathers) believed Baptism to be the birth "of water and the Spirit," those so born could not be without the Spirit, see below, c. 13, and de Anima c. 41, "re-formed by the second birth of water and the power from above," de Pudic. c. 6, "whatsoever flesh hath in Christ put off its former defilements, is now wholly another thing; it cometh up [out of the water] new, born of pure water and the cleansing Spirit." In like way, Pam. remarks that S. Cyprian says, Ep. 62 ad Cæcil. § 5, "By Baptism the Holy Spirit is received," and yet Ep. 69 ad Januar. "Whoso has been baptised must also needs be anointed, that having received the Chrism, *i.e.* the anointing, he may be the anointed of God, and have within him the grace of God." This, be it remembered, is tractarian teaching.

‡ Tertul. de Bapt. sec. 6.

§ S. Ephren's Hom. Rhy. x.

"And as the element of fire, when it meets with ore from the mine, straightway of earth makes it gold, even so and much more baptism makes those who are washed to be of gold instead of clay, the Spirit at that time falling like fire into our souls, burning up the *image of the earthly*, and producing *the image of the heavenly*, fresh coined, bright and glittering, as from the furnace-mould."* "That the need of water is absolute and indispensable, you may learn in this way. On one occasion, when the Spirit had flown down before the water was applied, the Apostle did not stay at this point, but, as though the water were necessary and not superfluous, observe what he says: *Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?*"† "First then, as I before said, He causeth defilements of our bodies, and afterwards infirmities of different kinds, to be done away by water. Because God, desiring to bring us nearer to faith in baptism, no longer healeth defilements only, but diseases also. For those figures which came nearer [in time] to the reality, both as regarded baptism, and the Passion, and the rest, were plainer than the more ancient; and as the guards near the person of the prince are more splendid than those before, so was it with the types. And *an Angel came down and troubled the water*, and endued it with a healing power, that the Jews might learn that much more could the Lord of Angels heal the diseases of the soul. Yet as here it was not simply the nature of the water that healed, (for then this would have always taken place), but water joined to the operation of the Angel; so in our case, it is not merely the water that worketh, but when it hath received the grace of the Spirit, then it putteth away all our sins."‡

"But why does Christ say, *Ye shall be baptized*, when in fact there was no water in the upper room? Because the more essential part of baptism is the Spirit, through whom indeed the water has its operation; in the same manner our Lord also is said to be anointed, not that He had ever been anointed with oil, but because he had received the Spirit. Besides, we do in fact find them receiving a baptism with water [and a baptism with the Spirit], and these at different moments. In our case both take place under one act, but then they were divided."§

"What then, my brethren? Because now, he who is baptized in Christ and believeth in Christ, doth not speak with tongues of all nations, is he not to be thought to have received the Holy Ghost? God forbid that our heart should be tempted to this faithlessness.

* S. Chrysostom on S. John, Hom. x. † Ib. xxv. ‡ Ib. xxxvi.
§ S. Chrysostom on the Acts, Hom. i.

We are sure that every one doth receive: only, how great the vessel of faith that he bringeth to the Fountain, so much doth he fill the same withal."*

"What meaneth, *Rivers of living water?* What is that water? Let no man ask me; ask the Gospel. *But this*, saith it, *He said of the Spirit, which they should receive that should believe on Him.* Consequently, the water of the Sacrament is one thing: another, the water which betokens the Spirit of God. The water of the Sacrament is visible: the water of the Spirit invisible. *That* washes the body, and betokens that which is done in the soul. By *this* Spirit the soul itself is cleansed and fed."†

"'He that believeth on Me,' as the Scripture saith, 'out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.'‡ And that it might be more manifest that the Lord there speaks not of the cup, but of baptism, the Scripture added, 'But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive.' For by baptism the Holy Spirit is received, and so they that are baptized and have obtained the Holy Spirit, come to drink of the cup of the Lord."§ "How unmeaning too were it, that whereas the second birth, whereby we are born in Christ through the laver of regeneration, is spiritual, some say that man may be spiritually born among heretics, with whom they deny the Spirit to be. For water alone cannot cleanse sins and sanctify a man, unless it have also the Holy Ghost. Wherefore they must needs concede either that the Spirit is there, where they say baptism is; or that that is not baptism, where the Spirit is not, in that baptism cannot be without the Spirit."‖

"And in the Gospel our Lord Jesus Christ spake with his Divine voice, saying, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' This is the Spirit which from the beginning 'moved upon the face of the waters.' For neither can the Spirit act without the water, nor the water without the Spirit. Ill, therefore, to themselves do those interpret, who say, that by imposition of hands they receive the Holy Ghost, and are so received; whereas it is manifest that they ought by both Sacraments to be born again in the Catholic Church."¶

"For saith St. Basil,** 'If there be any grace in the water, it is not from the nature of the water, but from the presence of the Spirit.'

* S. Augustine on S. John, Hom. xxxii. † Ib. on 1 Ep. John, Hom. vi.
‡ John vii., 37, 38. § S. Cyprian, Ep. lxiii. c. 5. ‖ Ib. lxxiv. c. J.
¶ S. Cyprian, Con. Car. c. 5. **Basil. de Spiritu S. c. 15. p. 323, v. 2.

'And the water,'* saith Cyril of Jerusalem, 'purges the body, but it is the Spirit that signs the soul. When, therefore, thou art descending into the water, do not look upon the bare water, but lay hold upon salvation by the working of the Holy Ghost.'† 'But this benefit,'‡ saith Gregory Nyssen, 'the water itself doth not afford us, for it is the weakest of all creatures; but the command of God, and the coming of the Holy Ghost, coming mystically to our redemption.'"—*Beveridge on Art.* xxvii.

But there must be an end of quotation. Folios might be filled with similar sentiments out of the writings of the early Fathers. There is no form in which the same doctrine does not appear in them, from the simple assumption of the necessary connection of the water and the Spirit in baptism, down to the most fanciful proofs and puerile arguments for it. Nor is it different in our own Church, among either the theologians of the past or the present. The *vexata quæstio* of baptism is not as to its significance, or the reality of its inward and outward parts, but as to their connection, whether *necessary* or not. Our Church begins her office by assuring those who bring children to be baptized, that, according to our Lord's words, "none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate, and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost," and exhorts them to pray that those who are brought "may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost." So in the first prayer she says, "Wash him, and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost;" and immediately after the use of the water, she thanks God for having "pleased to regenerate the infant with his Holy Spirit."§ What can prove the Church's opinion on the point, if these quotations are not sufficient?

But the Catechism does not put the same questions, or the same number, on baptism as on the Lord's Supper; and from this it is argued, that her belief in the nature and intent of the one sacrament is different from what it is in those of the other. But it is evident, at a glance, that no exact parallelism is attempted in

* Cyril. Hier. Catech. 3. 2.

† Cyril. Hier. Catech. 5. ‡ Greg. Nyssen. orat. de Baptismo Christi, vol. 3. p. 369.

§ See Appendix B.

the questions upon the two sacraments; for, had there been, the questions put in the one case might have been repeated in the other *mutatis mutandis*. I shall only further remark, on this part of the subject, that the appointment of the feast of Pentecost as the day for general baptism is another, independent, and Catholic proof of the relation everywhere understood to exist between the ordinance and the Holy Ghost. There are but few that need be told that that day has long borne the name of Whitsunday, from the candidates coming to the font in white garments. Indeed, I know of no principle more rigidly proved or more widely acknowledged than that for which I am contending,—viz., that the inward part or thing signified in baptism is the Holy Spirit.*

The doctrine of the sacraments, then, both in their nature and in their effects, would appear to be correctly stated as follows, according to Catholic belief:

BAPTISM.

Outward Sign. Water.	*Inward part or thing signified.* The Holy Spirit.
Subject . . . . . The body.	*Subject* . . . . . The soul.
Effects . . . . . It refreshes and cleanses the body.	*Effects.* . . . . . Sanctifies the soul.
Privileges. . . . It admits to membership in the visible church.	*Privileges.* . . . . . Gives membership in the invisible church.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Outward part. . Bread and wine.	*Inward part or thing signified.* The body and blood of Christ.
Subject . . . . . The body.	*Subject* . . . . . The soul.
Effects . . . . . "Strengthen and refresh" the body.	*Effects.* . . . . . Strengthen and refresh the soul.
Privileges. . . . Preserve the membership obtained by baptism.	*Privileges.* . . . . . Preserve the soul to life eternal.

There appears no Scriptural warrant for making the minister of baptism other than the minister of the Lord's Supper. The commission which was given in the words of institution, "Go ye and teach (disciple) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (*Matt.* xxviii., 19), was addressed to the same individuals as "Do

* See Appendix C.

this in remembrance of me."—(1 *Cor.* xi., 24.) The apostles unquestionably were those who, alone, received the commission in either case. Yet it is remarkable that we find no directly-recorded instance of baptism by an apostle. "Even on occasion of the baptism of nearly three thousand converts at once, recorded in the second chapter of the Acts, no intimation is given that the apostle who was present officiated; while, on the contrary, it is highly improbable that the ceremony was performed by any one individual. And in the history of the baptism of Cornelius and his family, it is observable that St. Peter did not himself baptize the new converts, but only gave orders for the performance of the rite. He 'commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.'—(*Acts* x., 48.)"—*Riddle's Chn. Ant., book* iv., 2.

The apostle Paul seems indeed to speak of baptism as of a rite, the administration of which he generally committed to others, though he refers to one or two cases in which he had officiated himself.—(1 *Cor.* i., 13—17.) And on the whole, we learn from the New Testament,—"1. That our Lord did not himself baptize, but that he intrusted his apostles and disciples with the administration of this rite. 2. That the apostles, although they administer baptism sometimes, did not however do this always, or regularly, but committed the office to others. 3. It cannot be determined whether other persons, either ministers or laymen, were allowed to baptize without a special commission. 4. Philip the deacon baptized in Samaria men and women, Simon Magus, and the Ethiopian eunuch (*Acts* viii., 12, 13, 38), without having received any special commission, so far, at least, as appears in the history. He appears therefore to have received his authority to baptize, at the ordination recorded in Acts vi., 3—7."—*Riddle's Chn. Ant., book* iv., 2.

As soon as we get from Scripture into uninspired Church history, we find an almost unanimous claim set up for the bishop as the proper minister of baptism. Not that he alone officiated, and on all occasions, in the admission of members into the Church, but

no other, whether presbyter or deacon, was allowed to administer the rite of baptism without the bishop's express license, which, as it was given at his pleasure, was revoked at the same.

And as the bishop was considered the authorized minister of baptism, and delegated his power to others, so also the times and the places of administration were appointed by him. "It is remarked, by the author of the Pontifical in the life of Marcellus,* that whilst he was bishop of Rome, he appointed five-and-twenty churches, as so many little dioceses, for the convenience of baptizing pagans upon their conversion, and an equal number of presbyters to minister in them. But still all these were subordinate to that one bishop, and acted by the authority and commission received from him. So that, as one of the Roman councils† expresses it, 'Though both presbyters and deacons, at some solemn times, were allowed to baptize at Rome in the bishop's presence, yet they were but officials to him, and what they did was reckoned his act and went in his name.' 'Tis peculiarly remarked to this purpose, by one of the bishops present at the Council of Carthage under Cyprian,‡ 'That Christ gave the commission to his apostles, and to them alone the power which was given him by his Father; and that bishops were the apostles' successors in governing the Church with the same power, and granting baptism to believers.' Hence it became a general and a standing rule in the Church, that presbyters and deacons were to perform no offices§ without the authority and consent of their bishop, because the Lord's people were committed to his trust, and he was to answer for their souls. This was particularly specified in the office of baptism by most of the ancient writers. The rule was as old as Ignatius, who delivers himself after this manner, in relation to this point: 'It is not lawful either to baptize‖ or celebrate the Eucharist without the bishop; but that

* Pontifical. Vit. Marcelli, ap. Crabbe Conc. tom. 1, p. 204.
† Conc. Rom. Can. 7. ap. Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. Lib. 3, c. 9.
‡ Conc. Carthag. ap. Cypr. n. 79. p. 241.
§ Canon. Apost. can. 39. ‖ Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8.

which he allows is well-pleasing to God.' He does not say, that no one beside the bishop might administer baptism, but that it was not regularly done without his commission or delegation: he being the chief minister of baptism, as well as of all other offices in the Church. In like manner Tertullian* asserts the bishop's original right as chief priest, independent of any other; and then the right of presbyters and deacons to baptize; but this in dependence on their bishop: for they are not to do it without his authority, for the honour of the Church, in the preservation of which peace is preserved."—(*Bingham on Lay-Baptism.*)

From these quotations, it is plain that the ancients considered the sole prerogative of baptizing to reside in the bishop, and to be by him delegated to his presbyters and deacons; yet we must not suppose that the latter were on terms of perfect equality in this respect in the Church. In fact it would seem that the presbyter had generally the authority to administer delegated to him, but the deacon only on very extreme occasions. "Among those called the apostolical canons there are four that speak of the ministers of baptism, and those mentioned are bishops and presbyters only, no mention is made of deacons. So, likewise, in the constitutions under the name of the apostles, all the inferior clergy, among whom the deacons are comprehended, are forbidden to minister baptism: 'We do not permit, say they,† the rest of the clergy to baptize, as readers, singers, doorkeepers, subdeacons, but only bishops and presbyters, to whom the deacons are to minister. And they that presume to act otherwise, shall bear the judgment of Corah and his company.' But in another place the Constitutions speak yet more expressly against deacons baptizing: for they thus distinguish‡ the offices of presbyter and deacon from each other: 'A presbyter is to teach, to offer the Eucharist, to baptize, and to give the blessing to the people; but a deacon is only to minister to the bishop and the presbyters, and not to perform the rest.' And again,§ 'A deacon does not give

* Tertul. de Bapt. cap. 17.
† Constit. Apost. Lib. 3. cap. 11.
‡ Constit. Apost. Lib. 3. c. 20.
§ Ibid. Lib. 8. cap. 28.

the blessing, but receive it from the bishop or the presbyter: he does not baptize; he does not offer the Eucharist; but when the bishop or presbyter has offered, he distributes it to the people, not as a priest, but as one that ministers to the priests.' Yet, notwithstanding this, 'tis asserted by the same author,* that a deacon may baptize, if he has a commission and authority from his bishop to do it."—(*Bingham on Lay-Baptism.*)

St. Chrysostom gives his opinion as follows:—"'Tis plain madness to despise so great a power, without which we cannot obtain salvation, or the good things that are promised us. For if no one can enter into the kingdom of heaven, except he be born of water and the Holy Ghost; and he that eateth not the flesh of the Lord, and drinketh not his blood, is deprived of eternal life; and all these things are performed by no other but those sacred hands, I mean the hands of the priest: how can any one, without these, either escape the fire of hell, or obtain the crown that is laid up in heaven?"† Epiphanius says, "the deacons are not permitted to celebrate any mystery or sacrament in the Church, but only to minister in the celebration."‡ And St. Hilary is so decidedly of opinion that baptism belongs of right exclusively to the apostolic order, that he thinks it was only the emergency of the occasion which made Philip baptize the eunuch, who could not wait for baptism by an apostle. His words are, "Sacramentum ipsum baptismi adeo impatientis desiderii cupiditate præveniens, ut a diacono ministerium apostolici officii, salutis suæ cupidus, exigeret."§ Pope Gelasius decreed, "Let not a deacon presume to baptize without the bishop or presbyter, unless they be far absent, and an extreme necessity compel him: in which cases it is sometimes allowed to lay Christians to do it."‖ And such continued to be the rule of the Church everywhere; for we find Isidore of Sevile, who wrote about the year 700, observing, "that the ministry of baptism belongs only to priests; nor is it

* Constit. Apost. Lib. 8. cap. 46. † Chrys. de Sacerdot. Lib. 3, c. 5.
‡ Epiphan. Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 4. § Hilar. Com. in Psal. 67, p. 242.
‖ Gelas. Ep. 9, ad Episc. Lucan. cap. 9.

lawful for deacons themselves to perform the mystery without the bishop or a presbyter; unless in their absence, when the extreme necessity of sickness requires and compels them to do it: in which case it is often permitted to faithful laymen."* "And thus it continued for many ages after in the English Church, as appears from the canons of the Council of York† held in the year 1195; and the Council of London,‡ in the year 1200; and the canons of St. Edmund, an. 1236, mentioned in 'Linwood's Provincial,' (lib. 3, tit. 24). In all which deacons are forbidden to baptize, except upon urgent necessity, when the priest cannot, or is absent, or through folly and indiscretion will not, and a child or a sick person is in imminent danger of death."—*Bingham on Lay-Baptism.*

Now, in such a general consent of antiquity, that the bishop is the sole authorized depository of baptism, and in the unanimous decision of all Christian Churches, ancient and modern, that at all events this authority is not to be extended beyond the body of the clergy, what are the grounds, I would ask, upon which Mr. Wilberforce lays down his maxim, that the intervention of the minister in baptism is only matter of decent ceremonial? The language of the earlier Fathers is express as to the necessity of the intervention of the divinely-appointed minister in baptism as in the Eucharist. The author of the "Apostolical Constitutions"§ says plainly, that deacons had no right either to baptize or offer; and Epiphanius‖ affirms that they were not entrusted with the sole administration of either sacrament; and in a passage quoted by the Archdeacon, on page 10 of his "Doctrine of Holy Eucharist," from St. Chrysostom, to prove that "to make the Divine bread, and to minister it, with the view to its being the food of eternal life,'¶ was the power, which is said to have been given by Our Lord to His apostles, and which they transmitted to

* Isidor. de Offic. Lib. 2, cap. 24. † Conc. Eboracen. c. 5.
‡ Conc. London. c. 3. § Book 8, c. 3. ‖ Hær. 79, Collyrid, n. 4.
¶ Ad vitæ æternæ cibum, cœlestem panem *perficere* ac ministrare.—*St. Hilar. in Matth.* c. xiv. sec. 10, p. 681.

their successors," we find whatever is said of the ministerial commission being necessary for the right administration of the one sacrament declared necessary for the other. The Archdeacon quotes this passage to shew that a specific commission was necessary for consecrating the sacred elements in the Eucharist. I now quote it to shew that the same was necessary, in Chrysostom's opinion, for the valid administration of baptism :—

"Do you not know," asks St. Chrysostom, "what the priest is? He is the messenger of the Lord. His statements are not his own. If you despise him, it is not he whom you despise, but God, who has ordained him. Does any one ask how it is known that God has ordained him? If you deny this, your own hope is made vain. For if God *effects nothing through him, you have neither the laver of baptism, nor do you partake of the mysteries.* . . . So that you are no Christian."

Now, either this passage proves nothing for either sacrament, or it proves something and the same for both. If it proves for the Archdeacon that the intervention of the priest "is not matter of decent ceremonial, but is essential to the validity of the ordinance" in the celebration of the Eucharist, it proves the same absolute necessity for his presence in baptism. What is Chrysostom's opinion of the *distinctive* theory of the quondam Archdeacon of the East Riding?

In fine, it appears quite clear that the ancient Church, universally considered the authority to administer baptism lodged solely with the bishop, which might by him be delegated to presbyters unquestionably, but not without urgent necessity to deacons or laymen. While all seem to have agreed on this point, there was a great variety of individual opinions on the cases which daily arose, as to the baptism of such as were not duly authorized to administer it,—viz., of deacons, laymen, deposed clerics, women, and heretics. It is difficult to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion as to the decision of the Church in general on these matters; but, on the whole, it seems that the more common opinion was, that nearly all baptisms, however irregularly performed, if only water and the orthodox formula were used, should be con-

sidered valid; though there were many, as Cyprian and others, who urged re-baptization in several of these cases. Indeed, so difficult is it to draw any certain conclusion from the remains of the Fathers now in our hands, that the wisest and best men of modern times have not known to which side to incline, even when they thought the early Church the best guide on the subject. The modern Church of Rome goes so far as to say, that even Turk, Jew, or infidel may baptize, if only the true matter and form be observed. The Church of England, immediately after the Reformation, seems to have allowed any one to baptize; for the office for private baptism in the time of Edward VI. and Elizabeth ran as follows: "First let them that be present call upon God for his grace, and say the Lord's Prayer, if the time will suffer: And then one of them shall name the child, and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying these words: 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'"—*Bingham on Lay-Baptism.*

The indefiniteness of this rubric was the occasion of laymen and women administering the office, and it was one of the great questions of the day, whether or not such baptisms were legal and valid,—some of our divines taking one side in the controversy, some the other; most, however, agreeing that, though it ought not to be done in such manner, yet it was valid, and ought not to be repeated when done. The same seems to have been the prevailing opinion of the divines at the Hampton Court conference, in the reign of James I., who with the king at their head, altered the ambiguous rubric above quoted by inserting *lawful minister*, instead of *one of them that be present.* It must not be forgotten, however, that some of the best divines of modern days have altogether disallowed lay and unauthorized baptisms, among whom may be named Dr. Forbes, Mr. Lawrence, and Bishop Jeremy Taylor.

It may not be impertinent to remark, that of the foreign reformed Churches, the Lutheran and Helvetic, following Luther and Zuingluis in this matter, agree in general with those who de-

clare other than authorized clerical baptism, irregular, but not invalid. On the other hand, the Churches of Holland, France, and some others, following for the most part Calvin and Beza, pronounce all such baptisms invalid, as well as irregular, and re-baptize all who have had the ordinance administered to them in an unauthorized manner.

Now, it cannot but have been remarked, by every one who has perused the foregoing pages, not only that the universal opinion of the Church, in all ages, has been that to the bishop alone was committed the power of baptizing, which he might delegate to presbyters, but also that exceptional cases could only be excused on the ground of necessity. This necessity was, in the nature of things in the earlier days of the Church, arising everywhere, almost daily. Coupling this with the strictest interpretation of John iii., 5, "Except a man be born of *water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," the primitive Church considered that any, even the most irregular baptism, was preferable to none; and hence arose the extreme latitude which was conceded to irregular administration. It would not be easy to arrive at any other decision than that which was anciently come to, if we had to go over the same ground again, and seek for a safe conclusion, *ab initio*, for ourselves. If baptism be *absolutely necessary* for salvation, as some imagine, doubtless it is good that it be done most irregularly, rather than that it should not be done at all. "Necessity has no law;" and it certainly is better to break the order of the Church than to jeopardize a soul. It may be fairly questioned, though, how far the Church of England recognises this alternative. When she says that the sacraments are only "generally necessary to salvation," it is to be assumed that they are not so where they cannot be had, and where no impediment is in the mind of the non-receiver. This is manifestly the case with children; and it is not assuming much to consider them safe without baptism, though no right-minded person would leave to doubt such an important matter, when he might have it reduced to moral certainty. We may have hope, even *good* hope, in the

case of unbaptized infants; but it is a great consolation to the parent, who has been bereaved of his or her baptized babe, to be assured that "it is certain, from God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved."*

Now, it is evident that such cases of emergency could not arise in the matter of the Lord's Supper, which, being a *communion*, did not properly admit of private and individual celebration. When the sacred elements were carried to the absent and the sick, they were considered as participating in the public administration of the rite. Though, in the New Testament, we have no special intimation as to who was to be the minister of the Eucharist, yet we have even there undoubted evidence that the celebration was not private, nor even in private houses. (See 1 *Cor.* xi., 20, 22.) Indeed, the absurdity of private celebration is plainly seen in the arguments which have been urged against it in all ages of the Church. Thus: how could the priest say, "Lift up your hearts?" if there were none to answer, "We lift them up unto the Lord?" So that two at least, besides the person officiating, has always been required to be present to communicate. And as for the *place*, the Council of Laodicea prohibits any celebration in a private house.†

It was all but impossible, therefore, that, in the observance of the dying command of the Saviour of mankind, "when the disciples came together to break bread," that there should not have been some among them whose special duty and office it was to perform the ministerial parts of the ceremony. To imagine the elders of the Church absent at its general meetings and most solemn services, is by no means easy, nor is the thing itself probable. Possibly there never arose in the early Church a case in which necessity for administration by a private person existed,—indeed it could not arise, unless in the extreme of possibilities. What renders such an occurrence still more unlikely, is the fact

* Rubric after public baptism of infants. † Conc. Laod. c. 58.

that there seems to have been "but one common table or altar for the several churches in a district or diocese, where the bishop consecrated the elements, which were sent to the several officiating ministers in other places for distribution."*

We must also couple, with this unlikelihood of the defect of the properly-authorized minister, the absence of any positive declaration of Scripture, that the participation of the Eucharistic supper is "necessary to salvation." We have seen that the strong expression in John iii., 5, which was used by our blessed Lord to Nicodemus, was the ground upon which such a broad margin of exceptions was allowed in the case of baptism; but where is there such an emphatic declaration of the necessity to communicate? If we take into consideration these two circumstances, I believe we shall have sufficient to account for the absence of decisions in the early Church, in the case of the second sacrament, similar to those which we find respecting the first. The cases were widely different, and that difference fully accounts for the absence of vexed questions on the subject of the Eucharist, as well as for our not finding exceptions similar to those in baptism.

Yet there are not wanting instances of others than bishops and presbyters administering the Lord's Supper. It must be remembered that prohibitions to the contrary go for nothing, as well as declarations that authority to administer the ordinance was wanting. Nothing stronger on this head can be delivered than we have already quoted respecting baptism, which was *very frequently* celebrated by deacons and laymen notwithstanding. When, therefore, Ignatius† says, "Let no one perform any ecclesiastical office without the bishop," and when Tertullian‡ and Jerome§ say that presbyters have not the power to baptize, it is evident that they mean unless license be granted by the bishop. And as we know that such license was granted almost

* Rid. Chn. Ant. Bk. iv. c. 3, s. 4.
† Ep. ad Smyrneos n. 8. ‡ De. Bapt. c. 17. § Dial contra. Lucifer.

without limit (and the validity of acts performed without any permission, even by persons who had no pretence to the discharge of ecclesiastical functions, was allowed), it is manifest that no conclusion as to the invalidity of the celebration of the Eucharist, if it had taken place, can be drawn from these or similar passages. What was irregular, and even illegal to be done prospectively, was fully recognized after it had taken place. This was the case with baptism: there was nothing in the nature of things why it might not be so with the other sacrament.

But there is evidence that others than bishops and presbyters, as has been said, actually did consecrate the elements and administer them *alone*. St. Cyprian* speaks of a deacon "offering the cup," and the Council of Ancyra† forbids deacons under censure ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν; which, I think, necessarily implies that, when not in disgrace, they might ἀναφέρειν, which is the word mostly used of the act of bishop or presbyter in celebrating the sacred mysteries. It is true that the Council of Arles, which was held in the same year with that of Ancyra, declared themselves but little pleased with deacons thus taking upon them to offer at all, which they acknowledge to have been done to a great extent. "*De diaconibus*," they say, "*quos cognovimus multis locis offerre, placuit minime fieri debere.*"‡ To the same purport is also the decree of the Nicene Council, τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν.§ Now all these prohibitory decrees only go to shew that the "offering" by a deacon was not *recognized*. I do not think that they can fairly be said to prove more than that, for certainly equally strong passages prove no more in the case of baptism.

But there is one passage adduced from St. Ambrose, which is perhaps conclusive as to the point, viz., that a deacon might consecrate when he had the authority of his bishop. That Father introduces Laurentius, the deacon, addressing his bishop, Sixtus, when on the road to martyrdom, in these words:

* De lapsis. † c. 2. ‡ Con. Arelat. I. c. 15. § Con. Nic. c. 18.

"Quo sacerdos sancte sine diacono properas? Nunquam sacrificium sine ministro offerre consueveras. Quid in me ergo displicuit pater?—Cui commisisti Dominici sanguinis consecrationem, cui consummandorum consortium sacramentorum, huic consortium tui sanguinis negas."*

Now, here we have not only a distinction made between "the consecration of the Lord's blood," and "the partnership in consummating the mysteries," the exercise of which *consortium* was the usual and recognized duty of the deacon, but Laurentius says distinctly that the right to consecrate had been delegated to him by the bishop. Bingham tells us that Cardinal Baronius was so perplexed with this passage, that he changed *consecrationem* into *dispensationem*, without any authority whatever; and it must be confessed that the learned ritualist himself does not agree with the view of the passage which is here insisted upon. It seems to me, however, that the mode which he has adopted of surmounting the difficulty, is rather a cutting of the knot than an untyeing of it; for surely it is contrary to all the rules of fair criticism to interpret the more comprehensive term by the less so. Who would ordinarily consider *consecrationem* included in the *consummandorum sacramentorum, i.e.,* in the distribution of the elements, which was the more usual function of the deacon?

If it be asked why we have not more instances of this delegation of the full power to administer the Eucharist, on the assumption that it might be delegated, I have given the answer above:—(1.) There was no positive declaration in Scripture that communion was necessary to salvation, and (2.) there were probably no cases of necessity demanding it. But there may have been other considerations tending in the same direction, and Bingham himself gives us this reason for it:

"Because the Holy Eucharist was looked upon as the prime Christian sacrifice, and one of the highest offices of the Christian priesthood: and deacons being generally reckoned no priests, or but in the lowest degree, they were therefore forbidden to offer or consecrate

* Ambros de Offic. Lib. 1. c. 41. For further information and authorities consult Grotius: "De cœnæ administratione ubi pastores non sunt."

this sacrifice at the altar. This reason is assigned by the author of the Constitutions,* and the author under the name of St. Austin, and several others."†

On the whole, perhaps, the actual state of the case is accurately summed up by Riddle as follows: "The bishop consecrated, the presbyter administered the bread, and the deacons the wine; or, if a bishop were not present, a presbyter, acting as his representative, consecrated, and the deacons administered both elements. We find that, during the fourth century, deacons sometimes took upon themselves the work of consecration, as well as that of distribution; but this practice was regarded as wholly inconsistent with their office, and was expressly forbidden by several councils."‡

It is not easy to tell how far Archdeacon Wilberforce intends to instance the Church of England as favouring his teaching in the extract which forms the groundwork of the refutation in this chapter. It is said to be "orderly and decent that the water should be set apart with prayer, and that the ceremony should be performed by Christ's minister; but the absence of these conditions does not invalidate the act, either according to the belief of the ancient Church, or according to the existing law of the Church of England." It is true that the Church of England does not run counter to the opinions of good and wise men, in all previous ages of the Church, by declaring lay-baptism invalid; and in the administration of baptism to the sick, she does not *insist upon* the consecration of the water for the proper celebration of the rite; but, on the other hand, she has not officially recognised any baptism but that administered by a properly-authorized minister, and the last alteration of the service was to exclude that of all others. Surely this is going in the opposite direction to the Archdeacon. Nor do I know that the Church has, *totidem verbis*, prohibited deacons from consecrating the elements in the Lord's Supper. No canon forbids, no article disqualifies, no word in the

* Constit. Apost. Lib. 8. c. 28. † Bing. Ant. Bk. 2, c. 20, s. 8.
‡ Chn. Ant. Bk. 4, c. 3, s. 5.

ordination service excludes the deacon, as far as I know, from celebrating *alone* the Eucharistic feast. For, although no authority is given to the deacon to administer the sacraments, which is expressly given to the priest,—and the word *Priest* is used throughout the rubrics of the sacramental services,—yet we know that neither of these things excludes the former from the constant administration of baptism; and, therefore, no argument can be built upon them for exclusion from the latter. I am aware that deacons abstain, perhaps I might say they are excluded practically. I think, however, that the moderation and judgment of the Church is to be admired in this matter, which, while it does not recognise lay-baptism, does not condemn it, and secures the services of a presbyter in the Holy Supper, without declaring that no circumstances would authorise its celebration by an inferior officer in the Church.

We can now find it an easy matter to answer the question which is proposed to us: "Now, since the necessity of consecration is thus (that is, by the distinction made between the two sacraments), attested by the very nature of our ritual, how comes it not to have been put more prominently forward by our divines?"* We reply, because they did not view this *necessity* in the same light as those of the Archdeacon's school. Our divines did not consider the consecration effective of such strange results as are spoken of in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist:" they did not think that the pronunciation of a few words by *a priest* worked such a mighty charm as is imagined by the pupils of the Romish school.† I do not believe that it was any "unwillingness to break altogether with the foreign Protestants," which silenced our divines on the subject of consecration; for I find no trace of any holding back of what they believed

* Doct. H. Euch. p. 15.

† Archbishop Tillotson assures us that the magical power attributed to the pronunciation of the three words *hoc est corpus* gave rise to the vulgar *hocus pocus*. Such was the reverend idea entertained of this mighty miracle by the multitude to whom it was taught.

to be truths, though the enunciation of them might have been unpalatable to others. Take the single question of episcopacy, and do English divines shrink from propounding and defending it, because it is not in repute with foreign Protestants? I trow not. But the Archdeacon's reasons, as well as assertions, are to be received with great caution. He does not scruple to affirm* that in baptism the water "is never spoken of as gaining, in itself, any relation to the sacred object of which it is fitted to remind men." "The water is never spoken of as changed into blood, either in Scripture *or ancient authors*." Any one who has read the foregoing extracts from the Fathers (p. 21,) will see how far this assertion is from the fact. If we allow the Archdeacon's assumptions, and receive without questioning his assertions, he will prove his point, and draw deductions most logical and certain; but I think I have shewn that the grounds upon which all his arguments are built must be carefully examined, and his assurances tested by research; then we shall find that his proof is only a *reductio ad absurdum*, no evidence of the truth of the conclusion, but a manifestation of the viciousness of the premises.

I consider myself now fully entitled to declare, that the distinction attempted to be made in the matter of the two sacraments is shewn to be unfounded, and that the proofs professed to be given of the same have altogether failed. The two sacraments run *pari passu*, from the outward sign to the full spiritual blessing; while the conditions under which, and the persons by whom, they are to be administered, are, as far as they can be, just the same. *Exceptional cases prove nothing.* With the basis, then, must go the superstructure. As far as the conditions, upon which the wondrous transformations wrought by priestly power are built, are found to be fallacious, so far must the surprising results themselves fall to the ground. In other words, there is no essential difference between the two sacraments; the minister of each is

* Doct. H. Euch. p. 89.

the same; and the prayer of consecration, used in setting apart the outward elements, has the same effect in each case. No magic power is, in either, imparted to the visible symbol, so as to enable it to work as a charm; but, in virtue of divine appointment, where there is no obstacle in the recipient, he not only receives the outward signs or sacraments of the great things indicated, but finds them "certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."—(*Common Prayer, Art.* XXV.)

CHAPTER IV.

CHRIST IS NOT PRESENT IN THE EUCHARIST, BY A CORPOREAL PRESENCE, IN ANY MANNER—*i.e.*, NEITHER NATURALLY NOR SACRAMENTALLY.

THE change effected by the words of consecration, according to the East Riding and Romish theory, is that the subject (*this*, the bread) becomes identical with the predicate (*my body*),—the wine identical with Christ's blood. It is no apt representation, no sacramental similitude which exists, but the actual identity of the two things; in fact there is but *one* thing, for the bread has entirely vanished; and when *this* is said, it is bread no longer than whilst the words "my body" are being spoken; for on the instant, they become the latter in all the fulness of reality, whatever of the seeming of bread may remain. But the Archdeacon shall speak for himself:

"When Our Lord, then, spoke of His body and blood as bestowed upon His disciples in this sacrament, He must have been understood to imply that He Himself, Godhead, Soul, and Body, was the gift communicated. His manhood was the medium through which His whole person was dispensed." "For though it is the law of His nature, that His manhood is not everywhere present, as is His Godhead,—since the first does not partake in that attribute of omnipresence which belongs to the last—yet His Godhead is everywhere present with His manhood, and has part in all its actings. Whatsoever was meant, therefore, by the giving the body and the blood of Christ, as by the force of the terms it implied the gift of His manhood, so, by virtue of the Hypostatic Union, it involved that of His Godhead also."—*Doct. H. Euch.*, *pp.* 77, 78.

And that the early Fathers taught *such* a change in the sacra-

mental elements, and *such* a communication of Christ in them, is attempted to be shewn by the following quotations:

"That such was the gift bestowed in the Holy Eucharist, and that Our Lord's words of Institution were to be taken in their simple and natural sense, was the belief of all ancient writers. 'The Docetæ abstain from the Eucharist,' says St. Ignatius, 'because they do not confess it to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father raised up through His mercy.'* 'As Jesus Christ, Our Saviour, was made flesh through the word of God, and took flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have been instructed that the food which has been consecrated by His word of prayer . . . . is the flesh and blood of that Incarnate Jesus.'† 'Our flesh,' says Tertullian, 'is fed with the body and blood of Christ, that our soul, too, may be enriched of God.'‡ So that the statements of the second century tally exactly with the language of those Liturgic Offices, which exhibit to us the belief of the fourth. 'Deliver us from evil, O Lord Jesus Christ. We eat Thy body, which was crucified for us, and drink Thy sacred blood, which was shed for us: may Thy sacred body be made our salvation; and Thy sacred blood be for the remission of our sins, here and for evermore.'§ And these general declarations respecting the Holy Eucharist are associated by St. Cyprian with the original act of Christ, and with His words of Institution. For He it is who is still the agent in this work, through the intervention of His ministers. And 'if Jesus Christ, Our Lord and God, is Himself the High Priest of God the Father, and has offered Himself first as a sacrifice to the Father, and commanded this to be done in commemoration of Him, surely that priest truly discharges the office of Christ, who imitates what Christ did; and he then offers in the Church a true and full sacrifice to God the Father, if he begins to offer as he sees that Christ Himself has offered.'‖

"That which Our Lord affirmed to be present then, by the words of Institution, was His own body and blood. These were the *Predicates* which He connected with those elements of bread and wine, which He took into His hands and blessed. The nature of the connexion we shall consider presently: that though real it was not carnal—(that is, it is not flesh and blood as they are found on the shambles): as yet we are concerned with the *Predicates* themselves, that is, with the body

* Ad Smyrnæos, 6. † Apolog. i. 66. ‡ De Resurrec. 8.
§ Missale Gothicum. Missa Dominicalis, 80. Mabillon, p. 300. (Paris, 1729.
‖ S. Cyprian. ad Cæcil. Ep. 63, 14.

and blood which He bestowed. We have seen that it was that self-same body and blood which He had taken of the blessed Virgin, of her substance, and which so shortly afterwards He offered upon the cross. This it is which forms the link between Him and man's nature; it was bound by the unalterable tie of personality to Himself; and as He then gave it Himself to His twelve apostles, so He still communicates it by the ministration of their successors to the faithful, in the Holy Eucharist."—*Doct. H. Euch.*, *pp.* 78—80.

Now nothing can exceed the fulness and distinctness with which the *real* presence is here propounded for our acceptance. It will not be my business now to enquire into the sense in which the Church of England declares her belief in the real presence; that shall be done when we come to investigate the *true* doctrine of the Lord's Supper from Scripture, according to the opinions of the early Fathers, of our own Church in Saxon times and since the blessed Reformation. I shall confine myself now to the refutation of the error which is inculcated in the above extracts—viz., that Christ is corporeally present in, and necessarily received with, the bread and wine in the Eucharist, and in such manner as he is not received in any other rite; and, in doing this, recourse must be had to such modes of demonstration as lie open to us.

It has been already shewn, that no conclusion can be drawn as to the exact doctrinal belief of the Fathers from the names and epithets which they apply to the sacramental emblems; for in this case, it would be as easy to prove that the water of baptism is the blood of Christ, as that the wine of the Eucharist is so. The same may be asserted of the effects ascribed to the use of the elements. It has always been the misfortune of the Romish controversy, that those who wish to prove the Romish theory, take every flowery and figurative expression of the Fathers, as bound down to the most rigid or literal interpretation. There is only one way of meeting this line of argumentation effectually, and that is to shew that it proves too much. If a man will insist upon the literal interpretation of the words, "the food which has been consecrated by His word of prayer . . . . is the

flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus," then there is nothing for it but to bind him to the same strictness of interpretation, when we read, "he was baptized in the blood of the Lamb, whom he read of in the prophet."* When we find similar, if not the same, language used of other rites as we have in the case of the Eucharist, one of two things must follow; either we must interpret these respecting the Eucharist figuratively, as we do those on other subjects, or we must apply to the latter the strictness with which we interpret the former. There is no question as to which reason dictates, and Scripture requires.

It is also open to us to produce statements of an opposite character to those impugned by us; and, if these be clear, consistent, and natural, we then have no choice but to interpret the imaginative, poetic, and figurative, by the more sober and rational. Common sense suggests and ratifies this mode of proceeding, if any.

It is unnecessary to add a multiplicity of references to what have been given before, to shew that if a *change* is spoken of in the bread and wine in the Eucharist, a similar change is spoken of in the water of baptism, of the oil in chrism, &c. For instance, Gregory Nyssen,† speaking of the privileges which consecration advances things to, instances first in the water of baptism, and the great and marvellous efficacy thereof; and proceeds to that of an altar, which is at first but a common stone, but after dedication becomes an holy altar, which the priests only touch with veneration: and then adds the instance of the Eucharist,‡ "which at first is common bread, but, after the mystery has consecrated it, it is called and becomes the body of Christ. So the mystical oil, and so the wine before the benediction, are things of little worth; but after the sanctification of the Spirit, each of them operates excellently." What is here asserted of the bread and wine, is asserted of the baptismal water, an altar and the chrism. If these are not changed *in their nature*, neither are those.

* St. Hier. in Esa. 45. † Orat. in Bapt. Christi. ‡ Ibid.

I shall now at once proceed to shew that the Fathers, when they speak of Christ's body, speak of it as *really absent*. St. Ambrose says:

"Ascend (speaking to Christ) that we may follow Thee with our minds, whom we cannot see with our eyes. St. Paul has taught us how we should follow Thee, and where we may find Thee. Seek those things that are above, where Christ sits, &c.—Therefore we ought not to seek Thee upon earth, nor in the earth, nor according to the flesh, if we would find Thee.*—Mary could not touch Him, because she sought Him on earth: Stephen touched Him, because he sought Him in heaven. Stephen among the Jews saw Him absent."

St. Augustine's testimony of Christ's absence is equally clear. When speaking on the text, "the poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always."

"He spake this," says he, "concerning the presence of His body: for according to His majesty, according to His providence, according to His unspeakable and invisible grace, that is fulfilled which He said, Behold, I am always with you, &c. But according to the flesh which He assumed, according to what was born of the Virgin, &c. (directly contrary to the Trent Catechism and the Archdeacon), ye shall not have me always with you."†

And again, he says:

"According to the beautiful presence of His divinity, He is always with the Father; according to His corporal presence He is now above the heavens, at the right hand of the Father (he forgot to add, and in the holy sacrament), but according to the presence of faith, so He is in all Christians."‡

Cyril of Alexandria is very plain, and says:

"Though Christ be absent from the world as to His flesh, yet He is present to those that are in Him, and to the whole universe, by His divine and ineffable nature; neither is He absent from any creature, nor distant from any, but is everywhere present to all, and fills the whole universe."§

* Com. in Luc. 24.

† Tract. 50 in Joannem, in "Gibson's Pres. against Pop. vol. 9;" whence most of the following authorities are taken.

‡ Serm. 120 de diversis. § In Joan. 9, 5.

And again, speaking of the disciples, who thought that His being taken up to heaven would be a great loss to them, he remarks :

"They ought not only to have respected and looked* to his fleshly presence, but to have understood, that though he was separated from their society according to the flesh, nor could be seen by their bodily eyes, yet that he was present and assistant always by the power of his divinity."

To the same point Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspæ, in Africa, a great opposer of the Arians, bears clear testimony :

"One and the same (Christ)," says he, "according to His human substance, was absent from heaven when He was upon earth, and left earth when He ascended up to heaven; but according to His divine and immense substance, neither left heaven when He descended from heaven, nor forsook earth when He ascended into heaven."†

Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus, in the fifth century, delivers his opinion as follows :

"This was to go to the Father and recede from us, to take from the world the nature that He had taken from us. For see the miracle, see the mystery of both (natures) distinct" (not a word of the mystery of a body being in more places than one); "the Son of God according to His humanity departed from us; according to His divinity He says to us, Behold, I am with you always, &c. Those whom He left and departed from by His humanity, He did not leave nor forsake by His divinity." "When Christ was on earth He was not in heaven; and now because He is in heaven He surely is not on earth, &c. Because the Word is everywhere, but His flesh is not everywhere, it appears plainly, that one and the same Christ is of both natures, and that He is everywhere according to the nature of His divinity, and contained in a place according to the nature of His humanity" (which would be a bad argument, if His body were in heaven and the Eucharist at the same time). And then he concludes, "This is the Catholic faith and confession which the apostles delivered, the martyrs confirmed, and the faithful now keep and preserve."‡

Leo the Great is equally explicit :

"Christ," says he, "being raised up to heaven in sight of His dis-

* In Joan. 17. 12. † Ad Trasimund. l. 2. c. 17. ‡ Contr. Eutych. 1, 1.

ciples, He put an end to His bodily presence." (So he explains it, that He was to remain at the right hand of His Father till He should come again to judge the quick and the dead).*

And, lastly, the Venerable Bede testifies :

"Christ ascending after His resurrection into heaven as a conqueror, left the Church as to His bodily presence, which yet He never left destitute of the security of His divine presence, remaining in the Church always to the end of the world."†

Now it is next to impossible to conceive that such language as this, instances of which might be increased indefinitely, could be used by so many persons, and on various occasions, and no hint be ever dropped by any one of them, that there was a sense and manner in which Christ was still present with his Church corporeally,—in all the reality of his human nature, if they had had such belief. Nothing can be sounder than their teaching, it is true, but it is in direct antagonism to that of the Pope and Mr. Wilberforce. But the argument can be pushed much further than this. For it is not alone that the Fathers do not mention any corporeal presence, but rather speak against ; they go beyond this, and argue for its impossibility. Protestant divines have long considered the doctrine of the corporeal presence, as taught by the Church of Rome, and necessitated by transubstantiation, as at variance with the dictates of reason and the deductions of science. We shall find that the Fathers of the primitive Church were, in this matter, as good Protestants as ourselves.

The objections to the doctrine of transubstantiation, arising from the physical impossibility of Christ's natural body being in many places at the same moment, are thus sought to be obviated by the Archdeacon :

"We have seen that (the predicates) were the self same body and blood which He had taken of the Virgin, of her substance ; and which He so shortly afterwards offered upon the cross."‡ To this it is objected, "(1), That such a thing is impossible,

* Serm. 2. de Ascens. Dom. † Com. in Marc. 13. ‡ Doct. H. Euch. p. 80.

and (2), if not naturally impossible, it is yet burthened by such an amount of improbability as no evidence is able to overcome."

"It is said then, first, that it was impossible that our Lord could impart to His disciples that body and blood which pertained to Himself;" but "how can the possibility of such a thing be denied, considering the imperfect state of our knowledge respecting physical substance?" "That the glorified body of Christ can possess powers and properties beyond those which other bodies are known to possess, was shewn," says Kahnis, "before His resurrection, by His walking on the sea, and afterwards, by its entering through closed doors."* "Our Lord's human body is not *subject* to the laws of material existence, because His body is a glorified body."†

Such are a few of the sentences which the Archdeacon has put together in explanation of what he afterwards calls a *manifold*, a *dynamic presence*. How it can be, consistently with reason, he does not attempt to shew; but having filled several pages, in the attempt to prove that all the promised blessings of Christ are to be looked for through the *res sacramenti*, which is identical with what we see, and is really what we eat and drink in the Eucharist, he finds no difficulty at all in winding up with this: "*If* a *res sacramenti* be admitted, and that *res sacramenti* the body of Christ, *it is impossible to deny* that He is really present. And *hence it must be supposed* that such was the truth, which our catechism was designed to inculcate, since it affirms that the inward part, or thing signified, is the body of Christ."‡

The coolness with which these assumptions are consecutively made, and followed, a few lines afterwards, with the assurance that "*This is a truth* which neither Calvanists nor Zuinglians can recognise," would create some degree of wonder in the support of any other cause than that of Popery. It is surprising, not only that such a man as Robert Isaac Wilberforce can mislead

* Doct. H. Euch. p. 82. † Ibid. p. 131. ‡ Ibid. p. 142.

others by *such* modes of reasoning, but that he should be himself deceived by them.

We will now enquire into the opinions of the Fathers, as to the reasonableness of the Archdeacon's doctrine on *manifold* or *dynamic* presence; and it will certainly be some justification to him in propounding it, if we can find any indication, however faint, that such has been the teaching of the Church from the primitive ages.

In the first place, the Fathers reasonably distinguish between spirit and matter by the different qualities of each, and prove that God is a Spirit, by shewing that He is not subject to the conditions of matter. Thus, Gregory Nazianzen says, "If God be a body, what kind of body, and how?—an impalpable and invisible one? That is not the nature of bodies." "Oh! strange license, to imagine this,"* he exclaims; and equally strange is it, to confound conversely the differing natures of body and spirit, by ascribing to the former all the attributes and conditions of the latter, as is done in the case of our Lord's body by the figment of transubstantiation. "That is not a body," remarks Gregory Nyssen, "which wants colour, figure, solidness, space, weight, and the rest of its attributes."† But according to the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," a body may exist while wanting each and all of these properties. Gregory the Great tells us, when discoursing on the nature of a glorified body, "It will, therefore, be a subtile body, because it will be incorruptible; but it will be palpable, because it will not lose the essence of its true nature."‡ If he had known of the reputed wonders in the Eucharistic transformation, how comes it that he made no exception in its favour? The least which we might have expected would be this; for, as he was discussing the nature of a glorified body, and there was no other than that of Jesus then existing, it would have been but reasonable to state, that the then sole existing type was exempt from the conditions laid down.

* Orat. 34. † De Opific. Hom. cap. 24. ‡ Moral. Lib. 14, cap. 33.

Now list to what St. Augustine says:

"There can be no body, either celestial or terrestrial, aëreal or aqueous, that is not less in a part than in the whole; nor can it any ways have another part in the place of this part, but must have one here, another elsewhere, throughout the several distant and divided spaces of place," &c.*

We see that Augustine, in this passage, expressly names celestial bodies, which must include Christ's glorified body; but when speaking of that body individually and directly, he says:

"We are not to doubt that whole Christ is everywhere present as God, and is in the same temple of God, as an inhabiting Deity, and in one certain place of heaven, by reason of the nature of his true body."

And again:

"God is whole in heaven, and whole on earth; not at different times successively, but both together; which no corporeal nature is capable of."†

In another place he remarks:

"Man, as to his body, is in a place, and passes from one place to another; and when he comes to another place, he is no longer in that place from whence he came. But God fills all things, and is everywhere whole, not confined to places according to spaces. Christ, according to his visible flesh, was on earth; according to his invisible majesty, in heaven and earth."‡

And in his book against Faustus, he says:

"That Christ, according to his corporal presence, cannot be at the same time in the sun, and in the moon, and on the cross."§

And lastly:

"Our Lord is above, yet also truth, the Lord, is here: for the body of our Lord, in which He arose, must be in one place; his truth is diffused everywhere."‖

Theodoret, when speaking of the Divine essence, says of it, "Only the Divinity, as being undetermined, is not confined to

* Contra Epist. Manichæi, cap. 16. † De Civit. Dei. l. 22. c. 29.
‡ Tract. 31. in Joan. § Lib. 20. cap. 11. ‖ Tract 80. in Joan.

place;"* but speaking elsewhere of Christ's body after the resurrection, he says, "Still it is a body, having its former circumscription."† Fulgentius also remarks, "If the body of Christ be a true one, it must be contained in a place."‡ And again he declares, without any exception, "Every thing so remains, as it has received of God that it should be, one on this manner, and another on that. For it is not given to bodies to exist after such a manner as is granted unto spirits," &c.§

Now it will be perceived, at a glance, how irreconcileable this language of the Fathers is with that of the Archdeacon. The latter, following the Romish doctors, tells us "Christ was asserted to communicate Himself, as a whole, in every portion of the sacred elements." And "the ancient notion was identical with that which was laid down by the Greek Church at the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 1672. 'We believe that in every portion, even to the minutest subdivision, of the bread and wine, after they have been changed, are contained not any separate part of the body and blood of the Lord; but the body of Christ is always whole, and one in all its parts; and the Lord Jesus is present in His substance, that is, with His Soul and Divinity, as perfect God, and perfect man.'"—*Doct. H. Euch. p.* 70, 71.

It will thus be seen, that the doctrine which is now propounded for our acceptance in the English Church, after an abeyance of more than three centuries, is opposed both in spirit and letter to the doctrine of the early Church. We might increase the number of our quotations to any extent, but those which are given must prove sufficient, since they contradict the doctrine of Christ's corporeal presence on earth in every shape, by implication, by assumption, and by direct negation. In the opinion of the Fathers, such a doctrine as that of transubstantiation confounds the varying natures of things, and makes reasoning impossible. In fact, our senses are an incumbrance if we must believe absurdities.

* In Gen. qu. 3. † Dial. 2. ‡ Ad. Thrasimund. lib. 2. c. 18. § De Fide. ad Petr. c. 3.

But yet, another cogent proof that the primitive Christians did not imagine the humanity of the Saviour, in any special way, connected with the Eucharistic elements, is this—that whatever language they use with respect to the blessings conveyed by the worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper, the same they use of the worthy receiving of every other divinely-appointed ordinance. "The gift," to the devout worshipper, is by them never considered to be different, or differently conveyed, according as a change takes place in the religious service. *In all* it is assumed, according to God's promise, that those who humbly look to Him in the use of prescribed means, shall not fail of the desired end. *In all* spiritual grace is given, faith increased and strengthened, hope more assured, love warmed; in short, all the faculties of the soul invigorated, regulated, sanctified. To be the recipient of these blessings is to be a recipient "of the body and blood of Christ;" to share in these spiritual gifts is to be "a partaker of the divine nature." Neither Scripture nor the Fathers hesitate to declare these blessings, received by every humble and contrite soul, in whatever manner and at whatever time, it approaches the footstool of mercy, though special promises are made and special mercies vouchsafed to the congregation of the faithful, to the saints in communion.

The first passage which I will bring will be from St. Augustine, who shews that the faithful Jews in the wilderness, in the days of Moses, participated in the same blessings as we are said now to do in the Eucharist. In his Commentary on St. John's Gospel, he says:

"See the signs are varied, faith remaining the same. There the rock was Christ; to us, that which is laid on the altar is Christ; and they drank of the water that flowed from the rock, for a great sacrament of the same Christ; what we drink, the faithful know. If you regard the visible species or nature, it is another thing; if the spiritual or intelligible signification, they drank the same spiritual drink."*

* Tract. 45. in Joan.

And, again:

"The apostle says, that our fathers, not the fathers of unbelievers, not the fathers of the wicked, that did eat and die, but our fathers, the fathers of the faithful, did eat spiritual meat, and therefore the same (as we). For there were such there, to whom Christ was more tasteful in their heart than manna in their mouth. Whosoever understood Christ in the manna, did eat the same spiritual meat we do. So also the same drink, for the rock was Christ. Therefore they drank the same drink we do, but spiritual drink, that is, drink which was received by faith, not what was swallowed down by the body."*

That Christians now may become partakers of the body and blood of Christ, as did the Jews in the wilderness, by other means than Eucharistic celebration in the opinion of the Fathers, is manifest from the following passages:

"Thus Cyril of Alexandria says, 'The Gentiles could not have shaken off their blindness, and contemplated the divine and holy light, that is, attained the knowledge of the holy and consubstantial Trinity, unless by holy baptism they had been made partakers of His holy flesh, and washed away the blackness of their sin, and shaked off the devil's power.'"†

"And elsewhere, speaking of the eunuch: 'He by his question,' says he, 'shewed, that he was partaker of the Spiritual Lamb; for he was presently thought worthy of baptism.'"‡

"Fulgentius: 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you. Which whosoever can consider, not only according to the mystery of truth (viz. in the sacraments), but according to the truth of the mystery, will see that this is done in the laver of holy regeneration.'"§

"And again: 'Neither need any one in the least doubt, that every believer is then made partaker of Christ's body and blood, when he is made in baptism a member of Christ's body.'"‖

"Therefore St. Basil says, 'That the Lord takes away Christ from those who having put Him on by baptism, by sinning afterwards trample upon His body, and count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing.'"¶

* De util pœnit. c. 1. † In Joan. 9. 6. ‡ Glaphyr. in Exod. Lib. 2.
§ De Bapt. Æthiop. in fine. ‖ Ibid. ¶ In Esa. 3.

Neither transubstantiation, nor sacramental mastication of the divine emblems, is necessary to make us all that the Fathers declare us to be, by joining in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. "Believe and thou hast eaten," is the essence of all scriptural doctrine. But as there are other ways, besides participating in the Lord's Supper, by which we may eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood," so not all those who partake of the former are recipients of the latter. And here it cannot be too strongly insisted upon, that this one point, well established, would settle the whole controversy as to the identity of the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*,—*i.e.*, as to the necessary connection between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ, which they represent. For if the identity, of which we have heard so much, be a fact, there is no possibility but that he who receives the one must receive the other, whatever be his individual character. But if the primative Christians held that only the faithful received the thing signified, it is manifest that they could not have known the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," as it has been lately taught; that, in fact, they were ignorant of the principle of transmutation, and held the views on the Eucharist which we hold to-day. And, as there can be no doubt of the opinions of the Fathers on this head, we need not hesitate for a moment to declare them all good, scriptural Protestants.

It might have been supposed that the declarations of Scripture, on this point, would have been sufficient to prevent men going astray as to the means of communication between the sinner and the Saviour. Such passages as the following contain a doctrine so entirely opposed to that of Romanism, that it is no wonder the Papists are prohibited from reading the Word of God; and the doctrine propounded by Archdeacon Wilberforce is pure, unadulterated Popery. That the sacred records should, therefore, be opposed to his teaching, is no more than we might expect to find: that he himself should not be able to see this, must cause us wonder and regret. We will take Scripture first and then proceed to consider the testimony of the Fathers.

Whether or not Jesus was referring, by anticipation, to the sacrament commemorative of his death, in the discourse with the Capernaites, recorded in the sixth of John, one thing is certain: he spoke of a necessary connection between Himself and those who were to have beneficial interest in Him, as brought about by eating His flesh and drinking His blood. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," (ver. 53). Those who heard this declaration, it appears, did not understand it, or, at all events, were staggered at it. They exclaimed, with surprise and incredulity, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" (ver. 52). But earlier, in the same discourse, Jesus had told them that the participation of Him, which He propounded under the terms of "eating His flesh and drinking His blood," was to be effected, not by the mastication of the teeth, but by an act of the mind. Thus He had said, "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger, he that believeth on me shall never thirst," (ver 35); plainly indicating, that such as came to and believed on Him, should have the full effects of participating in Himself—the heavenly food. But he goes still further, and declares that there was no necessity for them to murmur, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" (ver. 60); for He asks, "Doth this offend you? It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Or, in other words, He assures them that it was not His natural flesh and blood that He meant, which, being eaten, could profit nothing; but that His words were to be understood in a higher and a figurative sense, as predicating the necessity of the soul's being quickened by the Divine Spirit, as the means of attaining to eternal life.

But as these explanatory words, which were intended to remove the difficulty of reception for the doctrine taught, were not effectual to insure a beneficial reception of it then,—for, "from that time many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him," (ver. 66),—so they are not sufficient to prevent misappre-

hension now. It would seem that the difficulty of the Capernaites was got over by the explanation, but they did not relish the doctrine itself, when explained, nor the personal remarks which our Lord made upon it. Now, however, the case is vastly changed. "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" is satisfactorily (to himself) answered by the Romanizer, without adopting the explanation of the Saviour; and he insists that sacramental communion, coupled with a transubstantial change, makes the whole clear and natural. But will the other conditions of the discourse consist with this idea? It appears not. The Church of Rome teaches, as witnessed by Aquinas (whom the Archdeacon delights to call *Saint* Thomas), that Christ does give His flesh to both bad and good to be eaten. "Seeing," he says, "the body of Christ always remains in the sacrament, till the sacramental species are corrupted, it follows that even wicked men do eat the body of Christ." And the Archdeacon adds, to the same purpose, "No less significant is the fact, that the body and blood of Christ were believed to be orally received, even by unworthy communicants."* And again, "they all believed the outward form to be uniformly accompanied by the inward reality,"† which is only a necessary consequence of the belief that the connection between the outward sign and the inward grace is one of identity.

But all this is very different from what our Lord discourses in the chapter before us. Not only does He not say that the wicked may eat His flesh and drink His blood, but He states it to be impossible. "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead; this is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die."—(*John* vi., 49, 50.) If the Romish interpretation of this passage be true, the *contrast* between the effects of the manna and those of the bread which came down from heaven, is entirely lost, and, indeed, untrue. "I am the living bread," continues the Saviour, "which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever,"

* Doct. II. Euch. p. 264. † Ibid. 267.

(ver. 51) ; " Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life ; and I will raise him up at the last day," (ver. 54) ; " As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father : so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven : not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead : he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever"—57, 58.) Now, a more flat contradiction than that which the Popish doctrine gives to these passages it is impossible to conceive. Jesus Christ says, that life is the natural and necessary consequence of eating His flesh, as necessary as that He Himself should live by the Father. " He that eateth me, even he shall live by me." " No," says the Romanist, avowed or covert, " the wicked may eat, and be lost." Let us now enquire what is the opinion of the Fathers on this point, " and if," as says an old author, " by their plain words, we can understand their sense, they assert that only the faithful, and not the wicked, eat the body of Christ, and drink His blood, in a proper sense. St. Jerome," says he, " calls the flesh of Christ the 'food of believers ;'* and Isidore of Seville, that it is the 'meat of the saints.'† And he adds (which makes it their food, and of none else), 'which, if any one eat, he shall not die eternally.' They therefore often call it the bread of life, and life itself. St. Ambrose : " This is the bread of life ; he that eateth life cannot die ; for how should he die whose food is life."‡ The same author continues :

" To this none has more admirably and fully spoken than Origen. Who having said a great deal about Christ's typical and symbolical body (which St. Augustine called before, the visible sacrament), he goes on thus : 'Many things almost might be said concerning that Word which was made flesh, and the true food, which whosoever eats shall surely live for ever, no wicked man being capable of eating it. For if it were possible that a wicked man, continuing such, should eat him

* In Oseam, c. 8.—Cujus caro cibus credentium est.

† In Genes. c. 31.—Caro ejus qui est esca Sanctorum. Quam si quis manducaverit, non morietur in æternum. [p. 304. Colon. Agr. 1617.]

‡ In Psal. 118. Serm. 18. Hic est panis vitæ : qui manducat vitam mori non potest ; quomodo enim morietur, cui cibus vita est? [vol. 1. p. 1203. Par. 1686.]

that was made flesh, seeing He is the Word, and the living bread, it would not have been written, that whosoever eats this bread shall live for ever.'*

"This is that which Macarius discourses of so largely and piously. Telling us, that as a great rich man, having both servants and sons, 'gives one sort of meat to the servants, and another to the sons that he begot, who, being heirs to their father, do eat with him.—So,' says he, 'Christ, the true Lord, himself created all, and nourishes the evil and unthankful; but the children begotten by him, who are partakers of His grace, and in whom the Lord is formed; He feeds them with a peculiar refection and food, and meat and drink above and besides other men, and gives himself to them that have conversation with their Father, as the Lord says, He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, abides in me, and I in him, and shall not see death.' "†

With this St. Jerome agrees, speaking of voluptuous men: "Not being holy in body and spirit, they neither eat the flesh of Jesus, nor drink His blood; concerning which He says, He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life."‡ St. Augustine also says, "Of that bread, and from our Lord's own hand, both Judas and Peter took a part."§ But then he makes the distinction himself, that Judas received only the "bread of the Lord," when the other disciples received the "bread that was the Lord;" which is directly contrary to transubstantiation; for according to that, even such a one as Judas must eat the Lord,

* In Matth. c. 15, v. 15, [p. 253, Ed. Huet.] Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος. Πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ λόγου, ὡς γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρῶσις, ἣν τινα ὁ φάγων πάντως ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δυναμένου φαύλου ἐσθίειν αὐτήν. Εἰ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν ἔτι φαῦλον μένοντα ἐσθίειν τὸν γενόμενον σάρκα λόγον ὄντα καὶ ἄρτον ζῶντα, οὐκ ἂν ἐγέγραπτο ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φάγων τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

† Homil. 14.—Ἀλλὴν τροφὴν δίδωσι τοῖς δούλοις, καὶ ἀλλὴν τοῖς ἰδίοις τέκνοις—Ἐπειδὴ τὰ τέκνα κληρονομοῦσι τὸν πατέρα, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐσθίουσι —Ἰδίαν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ τροφὴν καὶ βρῶσιν καὶ πόσιν, παρὰ τοὺς λοίπους ἀνθρώπους ἐκτρέφει, καὶ δίδωσιν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς, &c.

‡ In c. 66. Esaiæ. Dum non sunt sancti corpore et spiritu, nec comedunt carnem Jesu, neque bibunt sanguinem ejus, de quo ipse loquitur; Qui comedit carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum, habet vitam æternam. [vol. 4. p. 816. Veron. 1735.]

§ Contra. Donatist. post collat. c. 6. De ipso pane et de ipse Dominica manu, et Judas partem et Petrus accepit.

and no bread, when this Father says, that he ate the bread and no Lord.*

It is also very observable, that as the Council of Trent and the Archdeacon make eating Christ sacramentally and really to be the same, and spiritual eating to be of another sort, not real, but, one would think, rather imaginary: quite on the contrary, the Fathers distinguish the sacramental eating from the real, and make the spiritual and real eating to be the same; and they will grant that a bad man may eat Christ sacramentally (that is, in sign) but not really; for so none but the faithful can do it.

For thus St. Augustine: "Then will this be, that is, the body and blood of Christ will be life to every one, if that which is visibly taken in the sacrament, be in the truth itself spiritually eaten and spiritually drunk."†

Which in another place he expresses by the "visible sacrament," and the "virtue of the sacrament."‡ Again most expressly: "Christ saying, He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him, shews what it is, not sacramentally but really and in truth, to eat Christ's body and drink His blood."§ And therefore in the same chapter, speaking of wicked men, he says, "Neither can they be said to eat the body of Christ, since they are not to be accounted Christ's members."‖

St. Augustine again distinguishes the *sacramentum rei* from the *res sacramenti*. Thus: "The sacrament of this thing—is prepared on the Lord's table, and received from the Lord's table,

* Tract. 59. in Joan. Evang. Illi manducabant Panem Dominum: ille Panem Domini contra Dominum; illi vitam, ille pœnam.

† Serm. 2. de Verb. Apost. Tunc autem hoc erit, id est, Vita unicuique erit corpus et sanguis Christi, si, quod in Sacramento visibiliter sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritualiter manducetur, spiritualiter bibatur.

‡ Tract. 26. in Joan. Quod pertinet ad virtutem Sacramenti, non quod pertinet ad visibile Sacramentum.

§ De Civit. Dei. l. 21. c. 25. Ipse dicens, qui manducat carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum in me manet et ego in eo, ostendit quid sit, non Sacramento tenus, sed revera Corpus Christi manducare et sanguinem ejus bibere.

‖ Ibid. Neque enim isti dicendi sunt manducare Corpus Christi, quoniam nec in membris computandi sunt Christi.

to some to life, and to others to destruction. But the thing itself, of which it is a sacrament, is for life to every one that partakes of it, and to none for destruction."* For as St. Chrysostem phrases it, "He that receives this bread, will be above dying."†

I will conclude this chapter with two remarkable places of St. Augustine:

"The first is cited by Prosper, who has gathered St. Augustine's sentences: 'He receives the food of life, and drinks the cup of eternity, who abides in Christ, and in whom Christ inhabits. For he that disagrees with Christ, neither eats His flesh nor drinks His blood; although he takes indifferently every day the sacrament of so great a thing to the condemnation of his presumption.'‡ The other place is upon the sixth chapter of St. John: 'Christ,' says he, 'expounded the manner of His assignment and gift, how He gave His flesh to eat, saying, He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him. The sign that he eateth and drinketh is this, if he abides in Christ and Christ in him, if he dwells in Him and is inhabited by Him, if he cleaves to Him so as not to be forsaken by Him.'§

"And he concludes with this exhortation: 'Let all that has been said, beloved, prevail thus far with us, that we may not eat Christ's flesh and blood in sacrament (or sign) only, but may eat and drink as far as to the participation of the Spirit, that we may remain as members in our Lord's body, that we may be enlivened by His Spirit,' "|| &c.

* Tract. 26. in Joan. Hujus rei Sacramentum—in Dominica Mensa præparatur, et de Dominica Mensa sumitur, quibusdam ad vitam; quibusdam ad exitium. Res vero ipsa cujus et Sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium quicunque ejus particeps fuerit.

† Catena in Joh. 6, 49. *Ταύτης μέν τοι τῆς τροφῆς μεταλαβὼν, ἀνώτερος ἔσται τοῦ θανάτου.*

‡ Lib. Sentent. ex August. sententia (mihi) 341. vel. 339. Escam vitæ accipit et æternitatis poculum bibit, qui in Christo manet, et cujus Christus habitator est. Nam qui discordat à Christo, nec carnem ejus manducat, nec sanguinem bibit; etiamsi tantæ rei Sacramentum ad judicium suæ præsumptionis quotidie indifferenter accipiat. [p. 956. par. 1711.]

§ Tract. 27. in Joan. in initio. Exposuit [Christus] modum attributionis hujus et doni sui, quomodo daret carnem suam manducare, dicens, Qui manducat carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet et ego in illo. Signum quia manducat et bibet, hoc est, si manet et manetur, si habitat et inhabitatur, si hæret ut non deseratur.

|| Ibid. prope finem. Hoc ergo totum ad hoc nobis valeat, dilectissimi, ut carnem Christi et sanguinem Christi non edamus tantum in Sacramento, quod et multi mali;

Such is a fair specimen of the opinions of the Fathers on the subject of our 29th Article, which says, "The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing." Such language would be impossible in the mouth of any man believing in transubstantiation, or the identity of which the Archdeacon speaks. What the advocates of Romish doctrine declare to be received in the Lord's Supper by the wicked, is flatly and directly contradicted and declared impossible, by the Fathers of the primitive Church, as by those of our own. Scripture, reason, and the voice of Catholic antiquity, are all on the side of the reformed churches of the present day. It is deeply humiliating to our pride, as well as distressing to our feelings, that men of repute among us,—for position, learning, and moral worth,—should be so sadly deluded as to throw off at once this, as well as other important truths, with all their sanctions. "The gift," as conveyed in the elements, is a favourite phrase of Mr. Wilberforce; but it is difficult to imagine what idea he can have of "the gift" in the case of the wicked. He has forsaken the pure and sound teaching of the Bible, the Fathers, and the Reformation, for the obscene and blasphemous rubbish of an apostate church and a shameless priesthood. In lieu of such views as those, which I have given above, the following, from Romish divines, must be the Archdeacon's choice. Thus, when speculating on the reception of the whole Christ,—body, blood, soul, and divinity,—by the wicked, Dom. Soto, who was one of the learned doctors of the Council of Trent, says, "We must undoubtedly hold, that the body of Christ

sed usque ad Spiritus participationem manducemus et bibamus, ut in Domini corpore tanquam membra maneamus, et ejus spiritu vegetemur, &c.

See Patrick's "A Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of the Ancient Church, relating to the Eucharist, &c.," apud. Gibson's Preservative against Popery. [Ref. Soc. Ed. vol. ix. 1848.]

descends into the stomach, though a wicked man takes it,"* which Aquinas confirms: "Seeing the body of Christ always remains in the sacrament till the sacramental species are corrupted, it follows that even wicked men do eat the body of Christ;"† and he adds, "The body of Christ remains in this sacrament, so long as the sacramental species remain. When they cease to be, the body of Christ ceases to be under them."‡ And what are the consequences of this monstrous doctrine? Horrible in the extreme. Dom. Soto tells us, "We ought undoubtedly to hold, that Christ's body descends into the stomach. Since digestion is made in the stomach, there the species cease to be, and so also Christ's body, and therefore will not descend into the draught;"§ and, in case digestion is imperfect, he says, "If, by reason of any disease, the species should descend (into the draught he means), the body also itself would descend and be sent forth. For shame ought not to be a reason for denying the truth."‖ To all which the canonized St. Antoninus agrees, quoting Paludanus (professor of theology at Louvaine) as an authority. "Therefore," says he, "the body and blood of Christ remain so long in the belly and stomach, or vomit, or anywhere else, as the species remain, just as the converted substance (viz., bread and wine) would have remained. And if the species are vomited up whole, or go forth (downward), there is truly the body of Christ."¶

* In 4. dist. 12. qu. 1. art. 3.—Est indubiè tenendum quod corpus (sc. Christi) descendit in stomachum, etiamsi ab iniquo sumatur.

† Part. 3. quæst. 80. art. 3. conclus. Cum corpus Christi in Sacramento semper permaneat, dones species Sacramentales corrumpantur, etiam injustos homines Christi corpus manducare consequitur.

‡ In 3. part. quæst. 76. art. 6. ad 3. Corpus Christi remanet in hoc Sacramento, quousque species sacramentales manent. Quibus cessantibus desinit, esse corpus Christi sub eis.

§ In 4. dist. dist. 12. qu. 1. art. 3. Est indubiè tenendum, quod corpus (sc. Christi) descendit in stomachum.—Cum digestio fiat in stomacho, illic desinunt esse species atque adeo corpus, quare non descendit in ventrem.

‖ Ibid. Sed si ob aliquem morbum species descenderent, consequenter et ipsum corpus descenderet et emitteretur. Pudor enim non debet esse in causa negandi veritatem.

¶ Part. 3. tit. 13. cap. 6. sect. 3. Igitur corpus Christi et sanguis tamdiu manet in

It is hard to decide which predominates in these quotations, daring blasphemy or degraded filth. That the sons of the illustrious William Wilberforce should have abandoned their father's faith for such prurient obscenities, is not only a blot upon their "perilous inheritance" of a great name, but a disgrace to the age in which we live.

I cannot conclude this chapter without noticing the fact, that no more emphatic condemnation of the opinion, that the wicked eat the body of Christ, in the sacrament, is needed, than is acknowledged in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," and partly in notice of the passages which have been here quoted. "Origen's addiction to the Platonic philosophy would naturally lead him to undervalue any facts opposed to its spiritualizing tendency; so that he is a peculiarly unsafe witness respecting the Holy Eucharist. This circumstance destroys his authority, when he seems, though but uncertainly, to indicate, in opposition to the common judgment of antiquity, that none but devout receivers partake of the real body of Christ."* "In the sequel, Origen speaks of our Lord's body as the true food which no bad man is able to eat."† Nor does the quotation against Celsus, "We eat the bread, which is made a certain sacred body by prayer, and which sanctifies those who with good intent use it,"‡ militate against, but rather strongly confirm, this view, notwithstanding the Archdeacon's comment upon it; for had Origen had the idea that it was Christ's *real* body, he could not have said a *certain* sacred body, while he strictly confines the true reception to those who use it "with good intent."

And of St. Augustine it is remarked, "when he says, indeed, that Judas eat 'the bread of the Lord,' while the other disciples 'eat the Lord who was bread,'§ he was only expressing the truth, that a *personal* relation to our Lord, who gives His body for our

ventre et stomacho, vel vomitu, et quocunque alibi, quamdiu species manent, sicut substantia conversa mansisset. Et si species incorruptæ evomuntur, vel egrediuntur, est ibi vere corpus Christi.

* Doct. H. Euch. p. 248. † Orig. Com. in Matth.

‡ Cont. Celsum. viii. 33, vol. i. p. 766. § In Joan. lix. 1, p. 663.

food in this sacrament, is not dependent on the mere partaking of that food, but is reserved for its devout participants. And the same may have been his purpose, when he says that the *sacramentum* is given 'to some to life, to others to destruction,' but that 'the thing itself, of which it is the *sacramentum*, is given to every man to life, who is a partaker of it.'* He could not mean to deny that the inward part is present by virtue of consecration, and that all communicants receive it, because he says, in express words, that the body and blood of Christ are received even by those who do not profit by them."†

The remark about personal relation, &c., is simply "explaining away." If the bread had been the Lord in Mr. Wilberforce's sense, Judas *must* have eaten Him as well as the rest; and as for what we are told Augustine "could not mean to deny," he *does* deny it, most emphatically and often. Nor is this any contradiction to what is quoted from his epistle; for it is well known that the sacramental emblems commonly received the name of that which they represented.‡ I quite agree with the sentiment, "we are justified in explaining St. Augustine's lax and general assertions by his more systematic statements."

* In Joan. xxvi. 15, p. 500. † Epis. 140, sec. 63.

‡ Epist. 23. Si sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum non haberent, quarum sacramenta sunt, omninò sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt.

CHAPTER V.

THE ANCIENT FATHERS DID NOT WORSHIP CHRIST "IN THE ELEMENTS," NOR DID THEY CONSIDER THESE, NOR CHRIST IN THEM, A PROPITIATORY OFFERING FOR THE SINS OF THE LIVING AND THE DEAD.

THE Archdeacon proposes two tests by which to judge of the opinion of the primitive Church, as to the real—*i.e.* corporeal—presence of Christ in the Eucharist. These are the paying it divine honors by the highest act of adoration, and by attributing to its celebration the full virtue of a propitiatory sacrifice. That there may be no mistake, he shall state his own case, after which we will consider his proofs, and enquire of the Fathers for ourselves their opinion of his doctrine.

"First," then, says the Archdeacon, "the plainest proof which men can give that they suppose Christ to be really present in the Holy Eucharist, is to render Him divine honour. So much seems to be allowed both by those who admit the real presence and by those who reject it. Luther, as being of the former number, retained the elevation of the host when he drew up a service for Wittenberg.* Calvin† rests his assertion that our Lord ought not to be worshipped in the Holy Eucharist, on the ground of His absence; and affirms distinctly, that if our Lord were really present there, He ought to be adored. Bishop Andrewes‡ employs the same argument: but since he admits the real presence, he draws a contrary conclusion. "Christus ipse sacramenti res, in et cum sacramento; extra et sine sacramento, ubi ubi est, *adorandus* est." On this principle it was that the posture of kneeling for the reception of the elements was so warmly objected to by the Zuinglo-Calvinistic party. And its retention by the Church of England, in

* Hospinian, vol. ii. 19. † Calvin adv. Heshus, works, viii. 727.
‡ Andrewes' Resp. ad Bellarminum, viii. p. 266.

opposition to the repeated demands of the Puritans at home, as well as to the example of foreign Protestants, is a fact of great moment, by which she is allied to the ancient faith. *This fact is not neutralized by the somewhat ambiguous rubric which was affixed to the communion office in* 1662."

Now, here we have an instance of the very great caution which should be exercised before we either give or withhold our assent to a proposition. That of the Archdeacon above—viz., "the plainest proof which men can give that they suppose Christ to be really present in the Holy Eucharist, is to render Him divine honour" —is one to which no man, rightly instructed in Christian truth, would object; for who would not say, with Bishop Andrewes, " Christ must be adored wherever He is, whether in the sacrament or out of it?" That Luther and Calvin should say the same is, therefore, not to be wondered at. But what use does the Archdeacon make of this concession on the part of those divines? Why, that as we must worship Christ wherever He is, we may and ought to worship Him in the guise and within the bounds of the sacramental elements. Does it follow, then, because the Deity is everywhere, and should everywhere be worshipped, that, therefore, we may circumscribe Him within any definite locality and given shape? It certainly is a perfect *non sequitur* that, because theology allows the Deity to be everywhere, and in all things, therefore we may fix Him where we please as to place, matter, and form.

But it may be replied, " it is not the Deity, as such, that is thus circumscribed, but the Deity in conjunction with the humanity of Jesus; nor do *we* circumscribe Him, He is pleased to do this Himself." But surely it is of the very essence of idolatry to worship the Deity under a form, or as confined to a given place. The mind can conceive the Supreme Being present in all His perfections everywhere, and able and willing to hear the petitions of His creatures, and to relieve their wants; but if from this any one should begin to limit, and to say that because God was in His house, that, therefore, he was specially in the chancel and on the communion table, and in the bread upon it,

and that under this form and in that place we should worship Him —I ask, would not this be idolatry? If not, I have no definite idea of what idolatry is; for even the ignorant heathen must be very debased indeed before they can imagine the very stone or wood before their eyes, which they see and feel to be lifeless and lumpish, to be the very Deity of their adoration. Perhaps they have no definite idea at all: but that it is against the will of heaven to worship in such a manner, with whatever feelings, the second commandment clearly shews, and they who presume thus to approach the Most High, must not be surprised if they meet with His frown instead of a smile. "I the Lord, thy God, am a jealous God," is a fearful sanction to the prohibition of worshipping even the true God under any guise whatever.

And what is it but that which I have described to worship Christ in *that* bread? This theory of sacramental substitution provides a *sensible object* for adoration, of which the word of God gives no example, but which it most emphatically prohibits. Nor am I misrepresenting the Archdeacon. For although, in reply to the question, "Whether is our Lord present in this ordinance under a definite form, and in any particular place?" he says, "We have no reason, therefore, to suppose that form and outline belong to it; because these are the conditions through which things become an object to the senses of men."*

"And yet," he continues, as if he hardly knew his own mind on the subject, "there is one way in which our Lord's body may be said to be present with form and place in the Holy Eucharist. For there is a connexion between the *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti*, and form and place belong to the first, though they do not belong to the second. So that though the *res sacramenti*, in itself, has neither place nor form, yet it has them in a manner through the *sacramentum*, with which it is united. Christ's body, therefore, may be said to have a form in this sacrament, namely, the form of the elements, and to occupy that place, through which the elements extend."†

The devout worshipper, therefore, according to the "Doctrine

* Doct. H. Euch. p. 140. † Ibid. p. 141.

of the Holy Eucharist," must adore his God as of the shape and size of the wafer or bread by which he communicates. *That* is declared to be really, and in the strictest sense of the term, his God. He sees, handles, worships, and eats an entire Christ—body, blood, soul, and divinity! The heathen are innocent after such *Christianity* as this!

But the Archdeacon brings *proofs* to establish his theory,—*i.e.*, the Popish doctrine which he advocates,—from both the Church of England and the primitive times. From the former he brings two proofs, which immediately follow. "Our Lord's 'blessed body and blood' are communicated, as the first Book of Homilies expresses it, 'under the *form* of bread and wine,'" which he would have us take in *his* sense, that Christ's *real* body is given; the other, that the Church of England has retained the posture of kneeling in the reception of the sacred elements, on the principle that they are to be adored. "This fact," says Mr. Wilberforce, "is not neutralized by the somewhat ambiguous rubric,* which was affixed to the Communion office in 1662."

"This rubric," he continues, "only affirms that Christ's *natural* body and blood are in heaven, and not here, and that no adoration is intended, 'either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood.' The rubric certainly does not go on to state, as it might have done, that though Christ's body and blood are not *naturally* present, except in heaven, yet that their *supernatural* presence is bestowed in the Holy Eucharist; and that though no adoration be due to the bread and wine, or to any such corporal presence as the senses can take cognizance of, yet that Christ's body and blood, *really* present under the forms of bread and wine, as the inward part or *res sacramenti*, are entitled to, and receive adoration. Yet since the words which denied these truths have been omitted (in the last version of the Prayer-book), while the practice of kneeling for the reception of the elements continues to be enforced, there is nothing in this rubric which excludes the ancient belief, that Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist, by reason of the presence of His body and blood; and that the presence

* Rubric after Communion Service in Prayer-book.

of His body and blood is witnessed by the adoration to which they are entitled."*

Now, with regard to what is implied in each of the foregoing quotations,—viz., that the Church of England and the Archdeacon think alike,—it seems that very little indeed need be said to shew the fallacy and falseness of it. The Church asserts over and over again, that Christ's natural body is not in the sacrament, and therefore she could not mean to say that it is given under the *form* of bread; that is, according to the idea of Popish doctrine propounded for our acceptance, the real body of Christ is given in the shape and size of the consecrated element, which is the only sense of the paragraph. Did not Mr. R. I. Wilberforce know that the word *form* in his use, and that of the Homily, had a very different meaning? Either his honesty or his judgment is compromised.

With regard to the special pleading on the rubric, I have expressed myself strongly in my "Appeal to the Archbishop of York," on the subject of this book; nor can I qualify what I there wrote in the slightest degree. The sense of the rubric is too clear to be disguised—too full to be explained away. But it is attempted nevertheless. Let us enquire how. The rubric states that Christ's "*natural* body" is in heaven, and therefore cannot be on earth. "The rubric does not go on to say, as it might have done," remarks the Archdeacon, "that though Christ's body and blood are not *naturally* present, except in heaven, yet that their *supernatural* presence is bestowed in the Eucharist." It will be perceived that the rubric speaks of the thing, Christ's "*natural* body;" the Archdeacon speaks of a mode of presence, "*naturally* present," "*supernatural* presence." Can any one suppose that a skilful logician, and one who had taken high honors at Oxford, could confound these two such very different things, not being able to distinguish between the thing itself and what is predicated of it? The rubric says, Christ's *natural body is not* in the

* Doct. H. Euch. pp. 258, 9.

sacrament, that it is and could be nowhere but in heaven; it might have gone on to state, says the Archdeacon, that *it is* there, though not *naturally*, yet *supernaturally*. The Church of England denies *all* presence; the Archdeacon assumes *one mode* thereof. Which is at fault, his honesty or his judgment? "There is nothing," he says, "in this rubric, which excludes the ancient belief that Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist, by reason of the presence of His body and blood; and that the presence of His body and blood is witnessed by the adoration to which they are entitled."* Alas! Alas!

* The same sort of attempt is made once and again elsewhere, to avert the edge of the Church of England's Articles from the doctrines of the Church of Rome. "Transubstantiation," says our 28th Article (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) "in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. "There is one ancient writer alone," says Mr. Wilberforce, "whose words at all sanction the error of the Capernaites, and he would be scarcely important enough to deserve attention, did he not exhibit exactly that carnal view of the Holy Eucharist, which is censured in the Articles of the Church of England. This is Anastatius Sinaita, who wrote against the Gaianitæ, a sect of Eutychians, who denied that our Lord's human body had ever been corruptible." And after a long quotation from this man's writings, whose erroneous views never extended beyond himself, it is added, "This passage not only refers to our Lord's body, as though it still retained the same conditions which had belonged to it before the resurrection; but it also loses sight of the essential characteristic of a sacrament, by supposing that its inward part can be an object to the senses of men. So that it involves the very supposition which is censured in the 28th Article; such "change of the substance of bread and wine" as "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament." So that the divines of the Church of England, at the time of the Reformation, actually inserted this paragraph in the 28th Article on purpose to condemn an error which no one but this Anastatius Sinaita ever believed! But how came the Reformers to apply the word "Transubstantiation," the word peculiarly applied to the doctrine of the Romish Church, and invented for the purpose, to the obscure doctrine of the patriarch of Antiochia? They must have wanted something to do, and took an odd way to do it, first, to look for this Sinaita, and, then, when they had found him, to condemn his opinions under the very name of the Popish! What shall we be told next?

But this is not all; "The opinion here (in the article, that is) objected to must be something which runs counter to the sacramental principle, that is, to the idea that an inward part and an outward part are coupled together; the last an object to the senses, the former to the mind. Such a notion would have been rejected by Aquinas and the other schoolmen, although the different meaning which they attach to the word *substance*, produces a verbal contradiction between them and the Church of England. The word substance, in the 28th Article, seems intended to express that which is *material* in the consecrated elements; the *sacramentum* namely, or outward and visible sign.

Equally unfortunate appear to me those quotations which are brought from the Fathers. It is not to be denied, indeed, that they do, one and all, use occasionally very strong, unguarded, and perhaps even censurable language, with respect to the sacred elements in the Holy Supper. Before, however, we either give ourselves up to their guidance, or blame their expressions, let us enquire what was their probable meaning. This will keep us from too much facility in agreeing with, and too much haste in repudiating them.

And first, we must learn to distinguish between the worship due

But the meaning of the word *substance*, as understood by the schoolmen, was wholly different. The Aristotelian philosophy, on which their expressions were moulded, divided all objects into the *accidental* part, which was an object to the senses, and the *substantial*, which was an object only to the mind. By substance, therefore, in the Holy Eucharist, they understood not the *sacramentum*, but the *res sacramenti*. This more subtle sense of the word *substance*, which had become familiar in theology, was employed by the Council of Trent, when it declared its mind in opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation. So that when the Church of England denies that the substance of bread and wine is changed in the Holy Eucharist, she refers to the *sacramentum*, or that which is an object to the senses. But when the Church of Rome speaks of change of substance, there is no reason why she may not be understood to refer to the *res sacramenti*, or that which is not an object to the senses. If the question were understood in this way, the contradiction would be verbal rather than real; in language and not in thought. The carnal or Capernaite notion is that which the words of the Article really censure; for to exclude the idea of a *sacramentum*, or external part, would overthrow the very nature of a sacrament." Now, would any man believe that the divines of the Church of England meant not only to condemn an opinion of which no one had ever heard, but that they used the word *substance* for *accident*, because they knew no better, and this too at a time when the "more subtle sense of the word substance had become familiar in theology?" But "in this more subtle sense the word was employed by the Council of Trent, when it declared its mind in opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation." Thus we have the maxim exemplified—"one good turn deserves another;" for it seems that at the time of the Reformation, the English divines never thought of censuring the doctrines of the Church of Rome, nor the Council of Trent those of the reformed Church of England! This is certainly reading the ecclesiastical history of that period in a new and amiable light. But what is the meaning of the following? "When the Church of Rome speaks of change of substance, there is no reason why she may not be understood to refer to the *res sacramenti*, or that which is not an object of the senses." The *res sacramenti* is the body and blood of Christ. In asserting the change of *substance* in the elements against the Lutherans, how could the word refer to the *res sacramenti* into which it was about to be transubstantiated? Either the Archdeacon did not know what he wrote, or I do not understand what I read. As to which is at fault, I must leave others to judge.

to Christ, as God, present *in the sacrament*, and that to His body and blood, &c., as locally confined to the elements. "Christ is to be worshipped," as Bishop Andrewes says, "wherever He is, whether in the sacrament or out of it;" and it would be a very strange thing indeed, if we did not find constant and forcible exhortations to the worship of the Saviour, in works professedly treating of the most solemn rite of His holy religion. Where should men worship, or be exhorted to it, if not on the Sabbath, in the sanctuary and before the very altar itself? But whom and what do we worship? Not the elements, but Christ present in His Church, at the preaching of His word, in the congregation of His people, in His holy ordinances. And that this is the object to which the worship under such circumstances was given, is apparent enough from the language which the Fathers use, for they do not hesitate to use the same with regard to baptism, &c., which they use respecting the Eucharist. Thus St. Ambrose tells us, we should worship Christ in *the mysteries* both of baptism and the Lord's Supper;* and Gregory Nazianzen says of his sister Gorgonia, who went to the Church at night with whatever her hand had treasured up of the honored body and blood,† that she threw herself before the altar in faith, calling upon Him, who was honored upon the altar.‡ St. Chrysostom speaks in like manner as Ambrose of those who fell down before their king like captives, in baptism, and cast themselves upon their knees before Him.§ Did they worship Him as corporeally present in the water? He also says that the king bowed his body because of God speaking in His gospel. Did he imagine Him corporeally present in the roll of the book? But as there can be no doubt of the meaning of the Fathers when they speak thus of the worship given *in*, not *to* the Eucharist, it is needless to pursue this subject further.

* De Spiritu Sancto. l. 3, c. 12.

† Orat. 11. de Gorgon. Εἴ *πού τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος ἡ χεὶρ ἐθησαύρισεν.*

‡ Ibid. *Τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσπίπτει μετὰ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῷ τιμώμενον ἀνακαλουμένη.*

§ Chrys. in illud. Simile est regnum cœlorum, &c.

Secondly, the Fathers frequently urged that the flesh and blood of Christ, by which life and immortality were secured to the world, and which are ever united indissolubly with Deity, were fit objects of divine worship, without at all referring to the Eucharistic service. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem says, that though, without the Deity, to pay them divine honors, would be to bow down to man and worship a creature, yet since the Godhead is in conjunction with the human nature, it is a fit object of worship; and as we place all our trust in it, so we ought to worship it as no doubt the angels do in heaven; and specially, he says, when it is brought to our minds and thoughts by that which is appointed by Christ himself to be the *figure* and *memorial* of it in the blessed sacrament, and in baptism especially, when we put on Christ, and have his death and rising again represented to us, and have such great benefits of his death and incarnation bestowed upon us.* St. Ambrose says, in like manner, we ought, in the mysteries, to adore the flesh of Christ, . . . which we may truly call our Saviour.† The following is a good instance of how fancifully the Fathers argue sometimes, and I give the passage the rather because I find it quoted to prove the adoration:

"St. Ambrose and St. Augustine,‡ his scholar after him, supposing that there was a great difficulty in that passage of the Psalms, 'Worship his footstool,' for so it is in the Latin,§ without the preposition *at* his footstool, they laboured to reconcile this with that command of worshipping and serving God alone; and to give an account how the earth, which was God's footstool, could be worshipped; and the way they take was this, to make Christ's flesh, which he took of the earth, to be meant by that earth which was God's footstool; and this, say they, we ought to worship; the apostles did so whilst he was upon earth, and we do so now, whilst he is in heaven. We worship the flesh of Christ, which was crucified for us, and by the benefit of which we hope for pardon and salvation, we worship that, though it be now in heaven; we worship it in the solemn offices of our religion,‖ that flesh

* In actis Con. Eph. † Ut supra. ‡ August. Enar. in Ps. 98.

§ Adorata scabellum pedem ejus.

‖ Ipsam carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit (nemo autem illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit). Ib. [p. 1521.]

which he gave to be eaten by us for our salvation, that we worship, 'for none eats that flesh, but he first worships.'"

St. Jerome tells us that some persons undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, to worship Christ in the haunts rendered sacred by his presence. Did they expect to find Him corporeally there? By no means; but they supposed, and rightly, that a more vivid impression would be made on their minds as to the important events of Jesus' life, if they saw the place where they happened. So the broken bread and outpoured wine bring more vividly to our minds the broken body and shed blood, and quicken devotion in the ratio of our individual realization of these momentous transactions. Jerome, moreover, says of himself, that he worshipped Christ in the grave, and Paula in the manger, just as we say we worship Him on the Cross, or in His house, not meaning, for one moment, that there is any corporeal union of the object of our devotion and the things and places with which we connect it.

Thirdly, the ambiguity of language has also, in this instance, as in a thousand others, tended to bring the whole matter into confusion. The term which is sometimes used to express divine worship is also used to express the deference which an inferior pays to his superior among men. The verb προσκυνεῖν, and the adjective πρόσκυνητος, express nothing more than the respectful prostration of the body, and determines nothing of the object to which it is done, nor, indeed, of the feeling of the doer. Many of the places of the Fathers, then, which are brought to prove adoration, prove no such thing. Respect is intended, undoubtedly, whenever these words are used, but the *amount* of respect is perfectly indefinite, as far as the words go. We must look to other circumstances to decide that. St. Augustine says that a singular veneration is due to the Eucharist—*Eucharistiæ deberi singularem reverationem*;* but then he says the same of baptism—*Baptismum, ubicunque est, veneramur*.† Origen, too, puts the matter in a very strong light when he says, "Ye that are wont to be

* Epis. 118. c. 3. † Ibid. 146.

present at the divine mysteries, know how, when ye receive the body of Christ, ye keep it with all caution and veneration, that no part of the consecrated gift be let fall; for ye think, and that rightly, that ye should be guilty of a fault, if any of it should be let fall through your negligence."* And then he afterwards adds, "But if ye use such care, and that very deservedly, about keeping His body, how do ye think it to be a less fault to neglect the word of God, than to neglect His body?" Boileau quotes the former half of this passage to prove the adoration of the host: will the latter portion prove the same for a copy of the Bible?

In short, though the Fathers constantly urge upon their hearers and readers deep humility and reverential conduct, in all approaches to the Deity in sacred worship, and especially in the case of a communicant, yet it is easy to see that they do no more than we should do now, and are very far indeed from encouraging them to adore the consecrated "bread and wine," which they still so designate. Indeed, so far is this from being the case, that we find the second Nicene Council urging the simple form of the Eucharist as an argument against idolatry. They say, "that to prevent idolatry, Christ appointed an excellent image and representation of Himself in the sacrament, without any manner of human shape, even the plain and simple substance of bread."† It would, indeed, have been a strange argument against idolatry to have quoted this sacrament, if it had been worshipped itself. It would have been *lucus a non lucendo* with a vengeance.

Having now come to a fair understanding with the Fathers as to their meaning, let us turn to the consideration of the texts which have been brought from them to prove the adoration of Christ's body and blood *in* the elements. I have said I think them *unfortunate*. The reader shall judge whether this is not a very mild word to use of them under the circumstances.

* Hom. 13. apud Boileau De Euch. Ador.

† Concil. Sept. Const. [Concil. II. Nicæn.] Act. 6. Τὴν εἰκόνα ὕλην ἐξαίρετον, ἤγουν ἄρτου οὐσίαν, προσέταξε προσφέρεσθαι, μὴ σχηματίζουσαν ἀνθρώπου μορφὴν, ἵνα μὴ εἰδωλολατρεία παρεισαχθῇ.

The Archdeacon begins his reference to antiquity in a tone of great confidence. "That such was the opinion (viz., that the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, is witnessed by the adoration to which they are entitled) of the ancient Church is testified by its writers of all schools and sentiments."* "Anastatius Sinaita speaks of a direct act of elevation in his day."† Now, certainly, if this testimony were beyond suspicion, it would be a very strange fact that we should find the first mention of the elevation of the host for worship at the very end of the sixth century, for Sinaita died in 599. Can we for one moment suppose, that the adoration of the elements had been regularly practised for nearly 600 years, and no notice taken of their elevation by any writer for that space of time, though we have works in abundance, during that era, which treat upon the subject of the celebration in all, even its most minute particulars? Yet the Archdeacon seems to deem this notice a very early one, from the apparent satisfaction with which he quotes it. I think its lateness a strong presumption against the thing to which it refers, if not absolutely fatal to its claims.

But I have said all this on the assumption, that the testimony is beyond suspicion for its authenticity: but what is the fact? There is strong presumption that Anastatius never wrote the book quoted at all. Indeed, it would not, perhaps, be too much to say, that one quarter *of all the ecclesiastical remains of antiquity* is suspicious, if not absolutely fictitious. The treatise from which the Archdeacon has made his quotation, is not generally considered to be genuine, I believe, even by Roman Catholic writers themselves. Jeremy Collier says of our author, "He has writ a great many tracts, but the critics are not all agreed about their being genuine, as *De S Trinitate, De Divina Incarnatione,* &c. There are other pieces go under his name, which I shall omit to mention (and among them this,

* Doct. H. Euch. 259.

† Post sacrificii illius incruenti consecrationem, Panem vitæ in altum elevat, ipsum que omnibus ostendit.—De Sacrâ Synaxi. Bib. Pat. Max. ix. 945.

De Sacra Synaxi), because of the uncertainty of their author. [See "Bellarmine, Possevin."]* If we were sure of the source of the testimony, it is too late to be worth much; as it is, it is perfectly valueless.

Our attention is next directed to a quotation from Cyril of Jerusalem. He is concluding his fifth lecture on the "Mysteries," and is just at the point of distribution of the elements; the whole passage is as follows:

"After this ye hear the chanter, with a sacred melody inviting you to the communion of the holy mysteries, and saying, 'O taste and see that the Lord is good.' Trust not the decision to thy bodily palate; no, but to faith unfaltering; for when we taste we are bidden to taste, not bread and wine, but the sign (*ἀντιτύπου σώματου*) of the body and blood of Christ.

"Approaching therefore, come not with thy wrists extended, or thy fingers open; but make thy left hand as if a throne for thy right, which is on the eve of receiving the king. And having hallowed thy palm, receive the body of Christ, saying after it, Amen. Then after thou hast with carefulness hallowed thine eyes by the touch of the Holy Body, partake thereof; giving heed lest thou lose any of it; for what thou losest, is a loss to thee as it were from one of thine own members. For tell me, if any one give thee gold dust, wouldest thou not with all precaution keep it fast, being on thy guard against losing any of it, and suffering loss? How much more cautiously then wilt thou observe that not a crumb falls from thee, of what is more precious than gold and precious stones?

"Then after having partaken of the body of Christ, approach also to the cup of His blood; not stretching forth thine hands, but bending and saying in the way of worship and reverence, *τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος*, Amen, be thou hallowed by partaking also of the blood of Christ. And while the moisture is still upon thy lips, touching it with thine hands, hallow† both thine eyes and brow and the other senses.

* Biog. Dic. under the name.

† It may be well here to explain, that the ancients entertained an idea that the sacred elements had a charm to protect or heal the several parts of the body touched by them. Hence the expression of Cyril above. In the case before mentioned (p. 82) by Nazianzen, of his sister Gorgonia, he tells us that she moistened the preserved elements with tears, and anointed her whole body therewith for the cure of a distressing malady, and, wonderful to relate, she was cured accordingly.

Then wait for the prayer, and give thanks unto God, who hath accounted thee worthy of so great mysteries."*

This is an interesting passage (notwithstanding its superstitious tone), from the particular description which it contains of the mode of administering the Holy Communion in the middle of the fourth century. I have therefore given it entire, and also with the further object that the reader may judge for himself whether or not it is likely that Cyril is instructing his people to *worship*,† in the strictest sense, the sacred elements. Let it be first remarked, that he does not scruple to call these elements, *after* consecration, *types*;‡ and secondly, if adoration were meant, there was the same reason for giving this to the bread as to the wine. But *respect* being all that was meant to be paid to the sacrament, the same *is* enjoined by Cyril to the two elements alike. Every scholar knows that the words τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος fairly express no more than this.

We come now to consider the passages adduced from Chrysostom to the same point. I suppose that not even the Archdeacon would deny that the first which he has quoted is figurative, when he speaks of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, as a "fearful and wondrous *sight*." And the same must be confessed of the next, as no one can understand it *literally*. "For if we come with faith, we shall assuredly see Him lying in the manger. And there will lie the body of the Lord; not wrapped as then in swaddling clothes, but on every side clothed with the Holy Ghost.

* Cyril. Hier. 5 Myst. Cat. 23, ss. 20—22.

† It is very trite to remark, that we use the word *worship*, in the same manner as did the Greeks, προσκυνεῖν. "With my body I thee worship," in the Marriage service; "the Worshipful the Mayor," or "the Worshipful the Mercers' Company," are familiar instances. And thus the word is constantly used without the slightest idea of religious adoration.

‡ In the fourth lecture Cyril uses the same expression for the same thing. "For in the figure ἐν τύπῳ, of bread, is given to thee His body; and in the figure ἐν τύπῳ, of wine, His blood." And, in the third, he used the same word of the water in baptism. "Ye were made Christ's by receiving the emblem, αντίτυπον, of the Holy Ghost; and of the oil in "the unction, the emblem, αντίτυπον, of that wherewith Christ was anointed, and this is the Holy Ghost." What was Cyril's opinion of a *res sacramenti* in baptism?

The initiated understand what I say."* It is not easy to see the object of quoting such highly-figurative and flowery passages as these; for surely it is not to be supposed, by any one, that they can be taken as *proofs* that the elements should be adored. Yet for what else are they brought?

But the Archdeacon remarks generally on this Father (p. 259):

"He states in various ways, that our Lord, as present in the elements, is entitled to the same reverence which was paid Him when He was visibly manifest in the flesh. He speaks of the Energumeni† as introduced into Church to pay bodily reverence to Christ, by 'bowing the head' when His presence is bestowed in the Holy Eucharist, because they may not join in the Church's words of prayer. And again, he describes them as brought in like prisoners, and placed as criminals would be at the time the judge was going to take his place, 'when Christ is about, as it were, to seat Himself on a lofty tribunal, and to appear in the mysteries themselves.'‡ He speaks of angels as 'trembling at the Church's sacrifice,' and as 'ministering at that table.'§ And he describes them as seen in a vision standing round the altar, with eyes fixed on the ground, like soldiers before their king."‖

The latter part of this extract, respecting the angels, we shall pass over without comment; for the double reason that the picture which Chrysostom has drawn has, and had no existence, save in his excited imagination; and if every word he says of the angels were strictly true *in fact*, it would not prove the point for which they are introduced to testify,—viz., that the elements of the Eucharist should be adored.

But what of the Energumeni? "They are introduced into Church to pay bodily reverence to Christ, by bowing the head *when* His presence is bestowed in the Eucharist, *because they may not join in the Church's words of prayer*." "But," says Bingham (answering Durantus,¶ who brings forward this case of the Energumeni, from whom probably the Archdeacon borrowed it), "Chrysostom unluckily spoils his argument; for at that time,

* Hom. de B. Philogon. iii. vol. i. p. 498.
† Hom. de Incomprehens. Dei Nat. iii. 7, vol. i. p. 470. ‡ Ib. iv. 4.
§ Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Ephes. 4, 5. ‖ De Sacerdotio, vi. 4.
¶ De Ritibus, lib. 2. cap. 40. n. 5.

he says, the Eucharist was not consecrated; so that if they worshipped the host, it must have been an unconsecrated host, which, according to Durantus himself, would be plain idolatry."* But it is not so with the Archdeacon, who is harder to manage than Durantus; and he gets over the difficulty as follows:

"Bingham objects that the reverence thus paid would be to the elements before they were consecrated. For the Energumeni were ordered by the Apos. Cons. viii. 7, to go out before consecration. But there are two passages in St. Chrysostom. When he speaks (p. 477) of the Energumeni as taking their place like criminals when the judge is about to mount the tribunal, because Christ is about to appear in the mysteries, he expresses the reverence which is due even to the *anticipated* mystery: but at p. 470, he speaks of their postures of reverence at the moment of the sacrifice itself. And the entire exclusion of the Energumeni was not the universal rule, as is shown by Concil. Araus. i. Canon 14, Concil. Arelat. ii. Canon. 39, Cassian Collat. vii. 30. St. Chrysostom's words are founded obviously on this last custom. The Apost. Constit. also introduce a second prayer for the Energumeni after the Oblation. viii. 12."†

Now let us examine the reasoning of these two extracts. The first says, "The Energumeni are introduced to pay bodily reverence, *when* the presence is bestowed." This is proved to be incorrect, and then they shew "the reverence, which is due even to the *anticipated* mystery;" so that they cannot acknowledge idolatry to enable the Archdeacon to prove his point. Then, again, "they are introduced into Church" *beforehand*, "because they may not join in the Church's words of prayer;" but when this begets a difficulty, it is easy to prove the contrary, and "the entire exclusion of the Energumeni was *not* the universal rule. St. Chrysostom's words are founded, obviously, on this *last* custom." Thus we see these poor Energumeni introduced "bowing the head," to prove their adoration of the consecrated elements in the ancient Church. It is shewn that they did this before the prayer of consecration had been offered. Then they break the first or second commandment, or both, by *anticipation*, because they

* Bingham's Ant. b. 15. c. 5. s. 5. † Doct. H. Euch. 260. note.

are excluded from "the Church's words of prayer." And again, they are allowed to remain through the whole service (so that their idolatry was quite gratuitous), of which one proof is that "the Apostolic Constitutions also introduce a second prayer for the Energumeni, after the Oblation viii. 12." How this proves them present I do not see, for the absent may be remembered in our devotions; and on looking into this liturgy, in Brett, I find mentioned in the same prayer, with the Energumeni, "all the saints, from the beginning of the world; the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs; those in slavery, in banishment, in prison; &c., &c." If the mention of those "under possession," proves them present, those which I have enumerated must have been present too! It certainly does seem as if the poor Archdeacon had been given up to the leading of some strange fatality.

If such scraps of quotation, and such puerile deductions as those above, are to establish doctrines of the utmost importance, it is evident that there must be at once an end of all certainty as to *the truth*. Anything that the most heated imagination or distempered fancy might conceive, might be established not only by scraps from the Fathers, but by reference to the Scriptures themselves. Will any one say why the water of baptism ought not to be adored, on the authority of such passages as the following, if that of the Eucharistic elements must be on those which have been given? St. Ambrose says, in an apostrophe to the water of baptism, "O water which hast washed the earth sprinkled with human blood, that the figure of sacrament should precede! O water, which hast had this honour to be the sacrament of Jesus Christ! Establish the adoration of this symbol of our spiritual regeneration."* And St. Chrysostom, in a passage already referred to, when addressing the candidates for baptism: "When you come," says he, "into the closet of the Holy Spirit, when you shall run into the marriage chamber of grace, when you shall be near unto that terrible and also desirable pool, prostrate your-

* St. Ambrose, tom. 3. in Luc. lib. 10. c. 22, apud L'Arroque, p. 566.

selves as captives before your king, cast yourselves altogether on your knees; and lifting up your hands unto heaven, where the king of us all is sitting on His royal throne; and lifting up your eyes unto that Eye which never slumbers, use these words unto that lover of mankind, &c."* When excited apostrophes such as these might be adduced to any extent (and they are acknowledged to prove nothing for adoration, when used in reference to baptism, to the oil of chrism, to the reading of the Scriptures, to hearing the word preached, &c.), on what principle of common sense can similar phrases be made to prove the adoration when used of the other sacrament? As I have said, if such passages are to be quoted as *proofs* of doctrine, there is no safety for truth.

"But it is not only in St. Chrysostom and St. Cyril," says our author, "but among the opponents of the Eutychians, who in expression were most removed from that which has been called the Eastern School, that we find direct statements that our Lord's body, as present in the Holy Eucharist, is a fit object of worship." Then follows a passage from Theodoret, which I will give with its context:

"The mystical symbols," saith he, "do not change their own nature after consecration; but they remain in their former substance, in their first figure, and in their first shape; they are visible and palpable, such as they were before; but it is conceived by the understanding, that they are what they have been made, and they are believed, and venerated, προσκυνεῖται, as being what they are believed to be."†

Having given but the latter half of this passage, the Archdeacon remarks upon it: "Theodoret speaks as though the elements themselves might partake of that worship which is due to the *res sacramenti*, which they contain. But this cannot have been his intention." I quite agree with this remark; and as the Father assures us that the elements are not in any manner changed by the prayer which has been offered over them, it is manifest that he cannot intend more by προσκυνεῖται, than that respect,

* Dialog. 2. p. 85.

† St. Chrys. In illud simile est regnum cœlor, patrifamil. t. 6. p. 550, apud L'Arroque.

which all right-minded men pay to such secular things as are separated to the worship of Almighty God. This is quite in keeping with what the same Father elsewhere declares—viz., that "our Saviour hath honored the visible symbols, with calling them by the name of His body and blood; not by changing their nature, but by adding grace to nature."* It would be well if Mr. Wilberforce were as sound in this matter as Theodoret.

But we continue. The next remark which we meet is, "And the same thing (*i.e.*, that the sacrament at large is an object of worship) is obvious from the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, where, after the consecrated elements have been the object of various acts of reverence, the priest says, "Look down, O Lord, from heaven upon those who have bowed their heads unto Thee, for they have not bowed them to flesh and blood, but to Thee, the fearful God." I have looked through St. Chrysostom's liturgy, as given in Brett, and can find no more special "acts of reverence" given to the elements after consecration than before it. There have been, it is true, some genuflections and crossings, both before and after, but I find no prayer addressed to the elements, nor to Christ, assumed to be in them. Nor do I think that any one reading the prayer, from which the above quotation is given, would ever imagine the bowing referred to, to have been made to the elements. Indeed, no such impression, I am bold to say, would be conveyed by perusing the liturgy itself. The prayer runs thus in Brett:

"We give thanks to thee, O invisible King, who of thine infinite power hast created all things, and of the multitude of thy mercy hast brought all things out of nothing into being. Look down from heaven, O Lord, upon those who have bowed down their heads to Thee; for they have not bowed down to flesh and blood; but to Thee a terrible God. Dispense, therefore, O Lord, these mysteries lying before Thee, to all of us for good, and according to the several necessities of each of us. Be present with all who travel by land," &c.

If this prayer had been addressed *to the sacrament*, it would

* Dialog. I.

have proved all that it has been adduced to prove. Unfortunately for the Archdeacon's theory, it is addressed, as all good prayers are, to God "in heaven." It was *there* that Jesus taught us to address "Our Father."

The next quotation which we have is from Leontius, but who or what he was is not yet settled. Some say he was a lawyer, some that he was a priest of Constantinople; and the paternity of the book whence the Archdeacon has quoted, is as doubtful as the identity of the individual to whom it is ascribed. "There are also *attributed to him* three books against the Eutychians and Nestorians, &c.," is all that Collier can say for the genuineness of this work. The passage, however, is unobjectionable in itself, for it is directed against the Nestorian heresy, which "denied that God, the Word, and the Man, Christ Jesus, were personally united." The writer asks to whose body and blood the Eucharistic supper has reference; or, in the phraseology of the time, "Whose body and blood do they suppose that they partake of in the communion?" It cannot be those of the Word, he reasons, for the Eutychians deny that He has become incarnate; and if they say those of the Man, Christ Jesus, then "they profess themselves man-worshippers." This reasoning is perfectly logical and conclusive on the point to which it was applied; but how it can prove the adoration of the host (to prove which it is brought), is more than I can perceive.

To the views from Ambrose and Augustine, as given in their Commentary on the 98th Psalm,* I have above referred. St. Ambrose says, "by the footstool we understand earth, but by earth the flesh of Christ, which even at this day we adore in the mysteries, and which the apostles adored in our Lord Jesus Christ; for Christ is not divided, but one: nor when He is adored as the Son of God, is He denied as born of the Virgin."† But if we are to understand Ambrose, when he says, "which we adore

* The 99th in our Bibles.

† Ambrose de Spiritu Sancto iii. xi. 79, apud Wilberforce.

in the mysteries," that the elements of the Eucharist were worshipped, we have no choice but to insist upon the adoration of the water in baptism. *He* makes no distinction, neither indeed should *we*. Protestants do adore Christ, present in all His ordinances, without distinction, as also did Ambrose.

It is evident that the object of this Father is to prove that Christ is worshipped as God-*Man;* not on one occasion and in one ordinance, but on *all* occasions. This adoration of the complex nature in one, he imagines, proves his point—viz., that God's footstool is earth, and earth the body of Christ.

St. Augustine's expression, *nemo autem illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit, inventum est quemadmodum adoretur tale scabellum pedum domini, et non solum non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando*, is quoted by Mr. Wilberforce as though the passage applied, and was intended to apply, to the eating and adoring of Christ in the Eucharist. My own strong impression is, that it has no reference to that ordinance, but is a truthful application of the language of our Lord in the sixth of John, which is largely referred to, and quoted by Augustine in his remarks on this subject. The words above given, the object of which is to prove that the *flesh* of Jesus, which He took of the Virgin, is to be worshipped, appear to me to have this signification. "Since then, He (Jesus) walked here in very flesh, and gave that flesh to be eaten (as he has said, John vi., 26—58) for our salvation, and seeing no one eats it but he who has worshipped (*i.e.*, the sincerely devout), we have found out in what sense such a footstool of our Lord's may be worshipped, and not only that we sin not in worshipping it, but that we sin in not worshipping." I can myself see no reference at all to the Eucharist, in the whole passage (which I have added in an appendix* for general consideration), at all events till we arrive at the last words, and these, it will be seen, are as thoroughly damnatory of the carnal or corporeal presence as anything that could be written.†

* Appendix D. † Augustine on Ps. xcix. sec. 9. Lib. of the Fathers, Oxon.

Whatever may be the language of these early Fathers of the Church, it is evident that it is not what it ought to have been, had they entertained the Popish doctrine of the actual and unconditional adoration of the elements. A few doubtful and hesitating passages are more calculated to mislead than guide, and I may now say that I have reviewed all which are given in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist" to prove the point. The reference to the language of the apostolical constitutions made by the Archdeacon is apologetical, as that of a "period when the Church was not yet established," and simply "sanctioning" his view of things. But what sanction for adoration can be derived from the exhortation to the deacon to "minister the body of the Lord with fear," and that to the people to "receive the body of the Lord and His precious blood, in an orderly manner, with fear and reverence, *as if* they approached the body of the king?"* These quotations prove nothing. What individual Christian, or body of Christians, ever failed to inculcate reception of the elements in a similar manner? The true state of the case is indeed acknowledged by Mr. Wilberforce himself, on the following page of his book. "Thus early," says he, "did those habits prevail to which later writers gave more exact expression, by which the presence of our Lord's body in the Holy Eucharist was clearly recognized. For the reverence which was shewn to the inward part or *res sacramenti*, in this ordinance, is not referrible to any express command:† it was the instinctive expression

* Apos. Cons. bk. ii. 57.

† The Archdeacon has the following note, in further confirmation of his acknowledgment of the doctrine of "development" in the matter of the adoration of the host. "The practice of reservation, and the worship due to Christ, as present 'under the form of bread and wine,' were not part of our Lord's original appointment (as the 28th article observes), but were deductions from the truths revealed respecting this sacrament, into which the Church was guided by the Holy Ghost. Bishop Overall censures certain 'zealots,' who 'morem ecclesiæ nostræ sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Christi de geniculis accipiendi oppugnant, aut eum saltem *colere* et *custodire* recusant.'" As usual with the Archdeacon, the latter part of his note he intends to contradict the former; for does he not mean, by italicising *colere* and *custodire*, which is called "the custom of our Church," to give them the sense of *worship* and *reserve*?

of those feelings which the Christian mind naturally entertained upon the revelation of its Lord's presence."

Having thus examined the quotations from the Fathers, alleged by the Archdeacon as proving the adoration of the host in the ancient Church, as well as having enquired into the meaning of the primitive Christians, when they speak of adoring Christ in the mysteries, worshipping Christ's flesh, &c., I shall conclude the consideration of the worship of the elements, or of Christ in the elements, by a brief statement of several particulars which, taken together, prove to a demonstration that the worship of the Eucharist was unknown in the early Church. I am indebted to Bingham for the summary; but I have satisfied myself, by particular examination, that it is strictly correct, and as nearly as possible in the words of the authors themselves:

Mr. Aubertin* has demonstrated out of St. Austin's works these several propositions, which are all point blank contrary to the adoration of Christ as corporeally present in the Eucharist. 1. That bread and wine are not properly and substantially the body and blood of Christ, but only sacramentally and figuratively.

If not, what does he mean by it? I have not access to the letters referred to; but from the extract, I understand the bishop to mean "to venerate," and "to be careful of" the sacred elements. I may also here further remark, that this is not the only case in which the said "development" is called in to give its friendly assistance. With regard to the use of the terms *sacramentum*, *res sacramenti*, and *virtus sacramenti*, it is said St. Augustine called the outward part *sacramentum*, the inward part *res* or *virtus sacramenti*. "*The last two expressions, which he used somewhat vaguely, were more accurately discriminated by later writers.*" "He does not distinguish between the *res sacramenti* and the *virtus sacramenti*; whereas, it would be more consistent to identify the first with the inward part or thing signified, and the second with its effect upon the devout soul." No doubt it would be more consistent with the Archdeacon's theory; but, as St. Augustine had no such theory, he did not adopt the Archdeacon's course. "St. Augustine formed the mind of the western Church. His followers at once adopted and matured his views; the *virtus* was more perfectly discriminated from the *res sacramenti*; the first was understood to be the effect attending the Holy Eucharist, the second the reality to which that effect was to be attributed: and thus it was upon his system that the chief writers of the west, Bede among the principal, based their phraseology."—(Doct. H. Euch., pp. 101, 191, 251.) All which means, that Augustine's followers more and more *developed* his views (how could they know them better than himself?) till they became what Trent left them, and he East Riding took them up.

* Albertin. de Euchar. p. 602, &c.

2. That Christ is not substantially and corporeally present in the Eucharist, but corporeally present only in heaven. 3. That true bread remains and is eaten in the Eucharist. 4. That the manducation of Christ in the Eucharist is not oral, but spiritual. 5. That the wicked do not eat or drink the proper body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. 6. That the same body cannot be in different places at one and the same time; and that this is particularly asserted of the body of Christ. 7. That a body must necessarily occupy some place and space, and be extended by parts, with longitude, latitude, and profundity. 8. That accidents cannot subsist without a subject. All which directly overthrow the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and consequently show, that the adoration which was given to Christ in the Eucharist, was not to His corporeal presence, but His spiritual presence, or to His body as absent in heaven.

On the other hand, there are most certain demonstrations, that there could be no such thing as host worship in the ancient Church, not only taken from their not believing transubstantiation and the corporeal presence, but from many other topics solidly deduced and substantially proved by two learned writers, Mr. Daillé* and Dr. Whitby,† in two excellent discourses upon this very subject, to which I will commend the reader, contenting myself to mention the heads of the principal arguments, which they have more fully drawn out and proved. Mr. Daillé ranks his arguments under two heads; some general ones against the worship of the Eucharist, saints, relics, images, and crosses; and others more particularly levelled against the worship of the Eucharist. Among those of the first kind he urges this as very remarkable, that in all the ancient relations of miracles, there is never any mention made of miracles being wrought by the Eucharist, as is now so common in later ages, especially in the book called the School of the Eucharist, which is a collection of

* Dallæ. de Objecto Cultus Religiosi, cont. Latinos, lib. 1 et 2.

† Whitby, Idolatry of Host Worship. Lond. 1679 8vo.

legends under the name of miracles wrought by the host upon sundry occasions. 2. He urges another general argument from the silence of all such writers of the Church as speak of traditions, that the worship of the Eucharist is never once named among them. 3. That among the heathen objections and calumnies which they raised against them, such as their worshipping the sun, and an ass's head, and the genitals of their priests, and a crucified and dead man, they never objected to them the worship of bread and wine, which yet had been very obvious and natural, and invidious enough to have accused them of, had there then been any such plausible ground for an accusation, as there has been in later ages. 4. The Christians used to object to the heathens, that they worshipped things that were dumb and void of life; things that must be carried upon men's shoulders, and if they fell, could not rise again; things that must be guarded by men, to secure them from thieves; things that might be carried captive, and were not able to preserve and deliver themselves; things that might be laid to pawn, as the Eucharist has been by some princes in later ages; things that are exposed to fire and weather, and rust, and moth, and corruption, and other injuries of nature; things that might be devoured by mice and other animals, and might be gnawed and dunged upon by the most contemptible creatures. All which objections might easily have been retorted by the heathen upon the Christians, had they then worshipped the Eucharist, which is liable to all the same reproaches.

These are general arguments against host worship, together with the rest of that idolatrous worship which now so abounds in the Church of Rome. But there are a great many more special arguments urged in particular against the host worship by that learned man. As, 1. From the silence of all ancient writers about it. 2. From their using no elevation of the host for worship for many ages (as Bingham has showed himself out of Bona). 3. The ancients knew nothing of ringing a bell, to give notice of the time of adoration to the people. 4. There are no

histories of beasts miraculously worshipping the Eucharist, which sort of fictions are so common in later ages. 5. The ancients never carried the Eucharist to the sick or absent with any pomp or signs of worship; never exposed it to public view in times of solemn rejoicing or sorrow; never adored or invoked its assistance in distress, or upon any great undertaking: which are now such common practices in the Roman Church. 6. The ancients never enjoined persons newly baptized and penitents to fall down before the Eucharist and worship it, as is now commonly done in the Roman Church. 7. The ancients never allowed non-communicants to stay and worship the Eucharist, as the practice now is; which yet had been very proper, had they believed the Eucharist to be their God. But they used it only for communion, not for adoration. 8. The ancients never used to carry the Eucharist publicly in processions, to be adored by all the people; which is a novel practice in the judgment of Krantzius* and Cassander. 9. The ancients lighted no lamps nor candles by day to the Eucharist, nor burned incense before it, as is now the practice. 10. They made no little images of the Eucharist, to be kissed and worshipped as the images of Christ. 11. They had no peculiar festival appropriated to its more solemn worship. This is of no longer date than Pope Urban IV., who first instituted it, anno 1264, and it is peculiar only to the Roman Church. 12. The ancient liturgies have no forms of prayers, doxologies, or praises to the Eucharist, as are in the Roman Missal. 13. The adoration of the Eucharist was never objected by the heathens to the primitive Christians; nor were they reproached, as the Romanists have been since, as eaters of their God. It is a noted saying of Averroes, an Arabian philosopher and physician, translator and commentator on Aristotle, "Quando quidem comedunt Christiani quod colunt, sit anima mea cum philosophis," since Christians eat what they worship, let my soul rather have her portion among the philosophers. This learned philosopher lived about the year 1150,

* Krantz. Metropol. lib. 11. cap. 39. Cassander. Consultat. sect. de Circumgestat.

when the host worship began to be practised, which gave him this prejudice to the Christian religion. 14. The Christians objected such things to the heathens, as they never would have objected, had they themselves worshipped the host; as that it was an impious thing to eat what they worshipped, and worship what they eat and sacrified. Which objections might easily have been retorted upon them. 15. The Christians were accused by the heathens of eating infants' blood in their solemn mysteries, but never any mention is made of eating the blood of Christ, either in the objection or answer to it. The ground of the story arose from the practice of the Carpocratians and other heretics, and not from the Christians eating the blood of Christ. 16. Lastly, the Christians never urged the adoration of the Eucharist in their disputes with the Ebionites and *Docetæ*, which yet would have been very proper to confute their errors, who denied the reality of the flesh of Christ.

To these arguments of Mr. Daillé, Dr. Whitby, with many of the same, has added these further: 1. That the Scriptures and Fathers deride the heathen deities, and say, that we may know they are no gods, because they have no use of their outward senses. 2. Because they are made gods by consecration, and by the will of the artificer, part of that matter which is consecrated into a god being exposed to common uses. 3. Because they were imprisoned in their images, or shut up in obscure habitations. 4. Because they clothed their gods in costly raiments. 5. Because they might be metamorphosed or changed from one shape to another.—All which might have been retorted upon the Christians, had they worshipped the Eucharist, without any possibility of evasion. Soto and Paludanus own that the whole Eucharist, substance as species, may be vomited up again, or voided at the draught; which, to affirm of the real body of Christ, the ancients would have accounted the greatest blasphemy. For these and the like reasons we may safely conclude, that there was no such practice among the ancients, as giving divine honour to the host upon presumption of its being the real body of Christ, though

they treated it, as the sacred symbol and antitype of his body, with all imaginable respect and veneration. To deduce these arguments at their full length would fill a volume; and, therefore, it is sufficient here to have hinted the heads of them in this summary account, referring the reader to those two learned authors, who have proved everything, they say, for fuller satisfaction.

It might have been supposed that, with proofs such as these, which have been elaborated with all the rigidity of mathematical deduction and all the elegance of finished scholarship, no one, with any pretensions to learning and research, could have passed from Protestantism to Popery by bridging for himself or others the "great gulph" between. Such, however, we find not to be the case. The fact, that since the introduction of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the twelfth century, the case has been altered in many of the above particulars, both on the side of its advocates, by many, minute, and special instructions arising out of the doctrine—and on the side of its opponents in withstanding and confuting it, ought to make any man exceedingly cautious how he receive the doctrine, if it did not lead him at once peremptorily to reject it. Nor can it be pleaded that there is not enough of ecclesiastical remains on this subject. I have alluded to what Albertine has done from the writings of Augustine alone, but the documents of later date are neither few nor unimportant. If the adoration of the host had been known to even the mediæval Church, we could not possibly be ignorant of it. For it is well remarked by L'Arroque,—"If we descend yet lower than St. Austin, we may inform ourselves of what hath been practised in the Church, since his death, upon the subject of the adoration of the sacrament; for we have, in the works of St. Ambrose, two treatises touching the same matter, made in the behalf of those newly initiated—of which the latter, entituled 'Of the Sacraments,' is more ample than the other. We have that of 'Ecclesiastical Offices,' composed by St. Isidore, archbishop of Sevile; the 'Book of Sacraments' of Gregory the First; that made by

Maximius, abbot of Constantinople, expounding very mystically all the action of the sacrament. German, patriarch of the same place, also employed himself upon the same subject; and hath at large all that long history of ceremonies practised in an age which had already departed very much from the simplicity of the primitive times. The book, called 'The Roman Order,' doth also examine all the particulars of the public service practised in the Church of Rome. We have, in the ninth century, the treatise of Rabanus, archbishop of Mayans, of the institution of clerks; that of 'Ecclesiastical Offices' of Amalarius Fortunatus; that of Walfridus Strabo, almost under the same title; that of Florus, under the name of 'Explication of the Mass.' In fine, we have several other treatises of the manner and order that ought to be observed in the celebration of the mass, or of the Eucharist, which Hugh Mainard, a learned Benedictine, hath caused to be printed with the books of sacraments of Gregory the Great; as that he took from the manuscript of Ratold, abbot of Corby, about the year 986. Another from the library of Du Tillet, and which he saith is the Roman order of year 1032; and a third of the priory of Saluse, in Normandy, of the prebends of the order of St. Austin, about the year 1079. But in all this we do not find one word of the adoration of the sacrament, no more than the interpreters and commentators of the history of the institution of it, which are not a few."

If, in spite of evidence such as this, positive and negative, men will, in their determination, *at all hazards*, to establish *priestly* authority and a sacrificial character in the New Testament ministry, rush on, blindfold, into error, it is little to be wondered at if God at length send them "strong delusion, that they should believe a lie."

The next point to which our attention must be directed, is the assertion "that the Holy Eucharist is a *sacrifice* as well as a *sacrament*," and that peculiar "importance has uniformly been ascribed to the Eucharistic sacrifice by the Church." The importance of this sacrifice, we are told, arises from this,—viz., that

it is the purpose of the Almighty "to gather together in one all things in Christ," through whom alone, as one great High Priest, we have access into the Holiest by that "new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, His *flesh;* through which, having entered, we shall become "fellow-citizens with the saints," and of "the household of God." It is then added:

"So that the acceptance which Christ has purchased by His death, is rendered available through all those acts of public service, whereby He puts men into relation with God; and of these acts the Holy Eucharist is the chief—because it is the crown of public worship; the bond, whereby men are attached to Christ; the focus, in which all Church ordinances culminate.

"But allowing that the Eucharistic service is important, because admitted to be the chief act of Christian worship, yet why is it called the Christian sacrifice? If the term is only applied in a general and metaphorical manner, every act of worship may be styled a sacrifice. If it be used with more reality and exactness, how does its employment consist with those statements of Scripture, which exclude all true sacrifices, except the offering of Christ? Now, what is meant in Scripture by an offering or sacrifice? In a strict sense it is something brought before God, and presented to Him with a view of obtaining His favour. This is the etymological sense of the word *offering;* and *sacrifice*, which is often used as its equivalent, involves, in common, the further idea of the slaughter of that which is offered. Now, in this full sense, there is no other sacrifice or offering which can be brought before God, except that body* of Jesus Christ our Lord, with which He paid the price of our salvation. This true victim complied with every condition by which a sacrifice is characterized, that it might be presented before God as the perpetual ground of man's acceptance. "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." For it was not only in the moment of His death that our Lord's body was the sacrifice for man: the shedding of His blood was the consecration of the victim; but the victim itself was set apart as the undying propitiation for sinners. So is it described by St. John,

* "Manus sacerdotum nostrorum vacuæ essent, si non illas veneranda illa, et sancta oblatio vivifici corporis et sanguinis impleret."—Guliel. Paris. De Sacr. Euch. cap. v. p. 427.

who beheld a 'Lamb as it had been slain,' in the heavenly courts: so is it explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where we read that Christ has 'offered one *perpetual* sacrifice for sins.'*

"If the Holy Eucharist, therefore, is to be called in any peculiar manner the Christian Sacrifice, it can only be by reference to that one perfect propitiation upon the cross, by virtue of which we have in heaven an abiding sacrifice. And hence it is, that the Holy Eucharist is discriminated from all other acts of common worship. For it is by this service only that the real intercession which is transacted in the Church's higher courts, is identified with the worship of its earthly members. If it were the *sacramentum* only, or external sign, which was presented before God in this service, it could have no greater value than pertains to the corruptible productions of this lower world: but since it is also the *res sacramenti*, or thing signified, it is *that very sacrifice* which our Lord has rendered perfect by the taking it into Godhead, and available by offering it upon the cross. And again, if this oblation were presented merely by an earthly priest, we might doubt whether his own sins did not impede his actions, but it is the peculiarity of this service, that those who minister it here below are only representatives of Him by whom it is truly offered: *He* speaks through their voice; they act by *His* power: so that the Church's offering finds a fitting minister in that Great High Priest, who sacrifices in heaven. The Holy Eucharist, therefore, is fitly called the Christian Sacrifice, not only because it is the chief rite of common worship, but because it is the peculiar act, wherein the effectual intercession which is exercised in heaven by the Church's head, reaches down to this lower sphere of our earthly service. It is no repetition of the sacrifice of the cross, nor any substitution of another victim, 'for although once for all offered, that sacrifice, be it remembered, is ever-living and continuous—made to be continuous by the resurrection of our Lord.'† When those who have been admitted to the fruition of the Divine presence fall down before Him that sitteth upon the throne, it is still 'the Lamb that was slain,' to whose virtue they ascribed their acceptance; and 'to Him His Church on earth in the Eucharistic service, in like manner, continually cries, "O Lord God, *Lamb of God*, Son

* Hebrews x., 12. *Θυσίαν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.* Hebrews ix., 12, and x., 10, 26, have been alleged, singularly enough, to be unfavourable to the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Their object, however, is to assert, against the Jews, that there can be no real sacrifice except that of Christ; so that they accord entirely with the assertion, that the sacrifice which is perpetually presented upon the altar, is identical with that which was once offered upon the cross.—(Wilberforce.)

† A Pastoral Letter, by Henry, Bishop of Exeter, 1851, p. 54.

of the Father, that *takest* away the sins of the world." Not that *tookest* away, but still takest; "Agnus Dei, qui *tollis* peccata mundi."* 'Let us weigh well,' says St. Gregory, 'how valuable to us is this sacrifice, whereby the passion of the only-begotten Son is perpetually imitated for our acquittal. For what faithful man can doubt that, at the very moment when it is offered, at the priest's voice the heavens are opened—that the angelic choirs are attendant on that mystery of Jesus Christ—that things above and things below, things in heaven and things on earth, are united, and that the visible is identified with the invisible?'† Such is the principle upon which the Holy Eucharist is called a sacrifice."‡

There can now be no doubt as to the nature of the sacrifice spoken of in the Archdeacon's book. It may not be quite useless to remark, that though the Bishop of Exeter is quoted as giving sanction to the proposed view of the perpetuation of the *juge sacrificium*, yet nothing can be further asunder than that of the bishop and the Archdeacon. The one shews that the great antitypical sacrifice of the cross is continuous in its effects, because He who offered it "ever liveth to make intercession for us;" "that sacrifice is ever-living and continuous—*made to be continuous by the resurrection of our Lord;*" the other says, "It is by this service (*i.e.*, the Holy Eucharist) that the real intercession, which is transacted in the Church's higher courts, is identified with the worship of its earthly members." The former makes its perpetual validity depend upon the presence of Christ at the right hand of the Father; the latter upon his presence in, and identity with, the Eucharistic bread and wine. Surely there it little agreement between such views as these.

But, to pass over all else for the present, I will at once betake myself to the consideration of those passages of Scripture which the Archdeacon has brought in support of his theory. The case of Melchisedec is the first adduced. David, as St. Paul reminds us, had prophesied in the Psalms, of Christ: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a priest for ever, after the

* A Pastoral Letter, by Henry, Bishop of Exeter, 1851, p. 54.
† Gregorii Magni Dialog. Lib. iv. c. 58. ‡ Doct. H. Euch., pp. 300—303.

order of Melchisedec."* When we turn back to the casual account which is given of this mysterious personage in Genesis, we find it comprised in few words: "And Melchisedec king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the Most High God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth: And blessed be the Most High God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all."†

Now, in the reference which the apostle makes to this man's history, it is to be remarked, that it is to that peculiar feature of it which had been previously noticed by the psalmist; for even if we think that there is something of type in Melchisedec's being king of Righteousness and king of Peace; in his being without assignable parentage or age, without recorded limits in his priesthood as to either its beginning or end (in all which particulars he was a priest *sui generis*, for both the pedigree and the age of the Jewish priesthood were rigidly fixed), yet the one point, to which the apostle ever recurs, is, "Thou art a priest *for ever*, after the order of Melchisedec." "His priesthood is not like that of Aaron, figurative, successive, and transient, but real and effectual, fixed and incommunicable, eternal and unchangeable, according to that pattern of it exhibited to Abraham, before the law, in the person of Melchizedec."‡ But what use does the Archdeacon make of this patriarchial type of the Saviour? It is remarked, indeed, necessarily, that He is "consecrated for evermore" to "an unchangeable priesthood," but the chief point of assumed resemblance is one which the apostle notices not. "He brought forth bread and wine," says our author, "and he was the priest of the Most High God." "And we know, when our Lord was consecrated to the like office: in that momentous night when the last passover marked the close of the ancient dispensation. Then did the true Melchisedec bring forth bread and wine: but we may not suppose that these were the *realities*

* Ps. cx. 4. † Gen. xiv., 18—20. ‡ Horne's Com. Ps. cx. 4.

which He offered: they were but the *sacramentum* or external sign—the real offering was the thing signified. He had Himself predicted the nature of the sacrifice: 'the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.' And, therefore, when the moment was come, at which the course of Aaron was to give place to the course of Melchisedec, 'He took bread and gave thanks, and brake it and gave unto them, saying, This is My body which *is given* for you: this do in remembrance of Me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in My blood, which *is shed* for you.' It was thus that our Lord initiated that priesthood of Melchisedec, which His apostles were ordained to perpetuate; for 'as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come.'"*

Now, if this idea of the Archdeacon's be the true one, and *the* point of resemblance between the Melchisedec of the Old and of the New Testament be in the similarity of their offering, how comes it that *the apostle takes no notice of it?* Surely it is not to be imagined that the men and times of inspiration were to be allowed to pass away uninformed, and that some interpretation more significant, as well as more real, was to be discovered in the after ages of the Church.

But see what difficulties have to be got over before the proposed theory *can* be true. It must first of all be proved that the bringing forth of bread and wine, on the part of Melchisedec, was a priestly and sacrificial act. Now, let us ask, on what ground is this assumption made? There is no authority for it in the volume whence the account is taken; nay, there is much of probability against it. Is it not much more likely that the bread and wine were produced, primarily, as a refreshment for Abraham and his weary men, even if we may suppose somewhat of a religious character given to the transaction by a part, or the whole, being dedicated to God? Indeed, the connection sought to

* Doct. H. Euch., pp. 304, 305.

be established between the bringing forth bread and wine, and his being a priest of the Most High God, is, in my opinion, perfectly imaginary. If a *for* had conjoined the two sentences of the verse instead of an *and*, there would have been good ground for making such a deduction. As it is, however, there is none but that which arises from the arbitrary division of the verses in our version, which, in this case, as in many others, appears to injure the sense rather than aid it. Would not this clause, "He was a priest of the Most High God," connect much more naturally with the following verse; nay, does not the sense even require it? That Melchisedec should have "blessed Abraham of the Most High God," because he was "a priest of the Most High God," recommends itself at once to our judgment, while it explains nothing of the bringing forth of refreshments for the weary, whatever of piety and devotional gratitude might mingle with the act, because performed towards those who worshipped the same Jehovah.

This, with respect to the case of the Melchisedec of the Old Testament. Let us now consider that of the Melchisedec of the New. I shall not here go into the question of the nature of sacrifice in general, nor of that of the Jewish economy in particular. Such as wish to see what can be said, and *well* said on this subject, may consult Archbishop Magee's invaluable work on the atonement. It is sufficient for my purpose here to remark, that the strict idea of a propitiatory, vicarious sacrifice, is only *fully* realized in the case of Jesus Christ. The Jewish sacrifices, and, indeed, all from the beginning, as the author above-named clearly shews, "appear to have been but preparation of this one great sacrifice," and "the entire rite to have been ordained of God, as a type of that ONE SACRIFICE in which all others were to have their consummation."

The appointment of animal sacrifices was in itself a standing lesson, that death was the consequence of sin; and that a deliverer would be provided at some then future epoch, according to the original threat in the first place and promise in the other. It

would seem that, in offering *an animal*, according to some previous divinely-regulated model, the oblation of Abel was accepted, while that of Cain, his offering being of the fruits of the ground, was rejected.* The same rule seems to hold, through not only the patriarchal times, and in the establishment of the Passover, but is still more fully developed in the Levitical sacrifices, a curiously-elaborated system of sanguineous types and prophetic expiation. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul."† The life of a religious Jew was one continuous round of ceremonial purification and expiatory bloodshedding; and that it continued so to the days in which the altar was finally overthrown, is evident from the Epistle to the Hebrews everywhere, of which the following passage will suffice for an example:

"Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath injoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission."‡

Now, it would appear self-evident that the great antitype of this elaborate system, must have his distinctive features recognised by suffering the same things as did the types themselves. It would be to use words without meaning to talk of *type* and *antitype*, where there was no resemblance, or where such resemblance was only casual and evanescent. That the sacred writers deemed the *keeping* to be bold, full, and permanent, is evident from their language. Thus, in the 40th Psalm, David, speaking prophetically of the person and office of Christ, urges the point of His incarnation, *for the purpose of standing in the stead of the Jewish sacrifices in the suffering of death;* and the same is strongly and

* Gen. iv., 3—5. † Levit. xvii., 11. ‡ Heb. ix., 18—22.

emphatically insisted upon, by St. Paul, in his notice of that psalm: "Wherefore when He cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a *body* hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, *I* come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do Thy will, O God. Above when He said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said He, Lo, *I* come to do Thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second."* It is very remarkable here, how often the apostle repeats, and how strongly he insists upon, the substitution of Christ's *body* for those of the animals referred to, till the latter are removed entirely, the former established in perpetuity. Nor is it in this passage alone, in which the same strong contrast, or, perhaps, I might better say, *comparison*, is made. Nay, it is even carried out into other particulars by the same apostle, in which latter, if the resemblance is strict, it ought to be so, also, in the former. In the beginning of the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he had made mention of certain parts of the construction and furniture of the Temple, and of the ceremonies attending some of its more solemn services; upon which he remarks: "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing; which was a figure for the time then present. . . . But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood, He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to

* Heb. x., 5—9.

God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"*

Now, it seems impossible to read these passages, and not see that the great point of resemblance between the sacrificial types and the real sacrifice was in that, in which, indeed, all true idea of a sacrifice consists,—viz., in the evident and true immolation of the body of the victim. Words can really no longer be called "the signs of our ideas," if such be not the true state of the relationship between the Jewish offerings and that which annihilated them all, by fulfilling them on the cross of Calvary.

Now, compare with this the view of Christ's sacrifice, which is presented to us in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." According to its system, "the Holy Eucharist is analogous to the sin-offering;" "the Holy Eucharist is said to be analogous to the greater sin-offering, &c.;" "the sacrifice of Christ, in the Holy Eucharist, is an antitype of the Jewish sacrifices;" "the Holy Eucharist differs from the legal sacrifices, because they were shadows while *it* is a reality;" "the thing offered in the Holy Eucharist is the body of Christ;" and "to offer the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist is the especial function with which the apostles and their successors have been intrusted by Christ."†

Now, in this system, it does not seem too much to say, that the real sacrifice on the cross on Calvary is forgotten, and the true antitype of the ancient sacrificial types entirely pushed out of sight. Instead of Christ having, "by *one offering*, perfected for ever them that are sanctified," "it is by this service *only* that the real intercession, which is transacted in the Church's higher courts, is identified with the worship of its earthly members."‡ St. Paul says of Christ, that it was not necessary "that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entered into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now, *once* in the end of the world, hath He appeared to put away sin by the

* Heb. ix., 8, 9, 11—14. † See Doct. H. Euch. contents, p. xviii. ‡ Ib. p. 302.

sacrifice of himself." But, says Mr. Wilberforce (speaking, of course, of the Eucharist), "thus is that sacrifice effected, which was predicted as the service of the Gentile Church: 'in every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering;'" and pages* are written to prove that "the rule of the primitive Church, shortly before the division of East and West, was a *daily* Eucharist, celebrated by the clergy."

There is one more point, in connection with this comparison of Christ with Melchisedec, which I will briefly notice. The apostle says, with reference to the king of Salem, that, in the tenure of his priestly office, he was "without beginning of days or end of life,"—*i.e.*, he, unlike the Jewish priests, had enjoyed a priesthood unlimited by age in either direction. No time is mentioned at which he assumed it; no age fixed at which it had to be laid down; so that in this respect, he, being "made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually."† It is, therefore, in vain that we make any enquiry as to the *date* of the appointment of Jesus to His priestly office; for as Melchisedec's exercise of the priesthood commenced as soon as nature allowed, and only ended when nature could discharge it no longer; so Christ, being "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,"‡ had His office assigned in the eternal counsels from eternity past, and will continue to hold it, perhaps, for the eternity to come. "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning;" and it is in vain to enquire as to the time *when*, with respect to Him, with whom "a day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

But that which, with regard to the Deity, may be without limits, may not be so with regard to man; and, therefore, "the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world," was slain on Calvary "in the fulness of time." So was it, also, with respect to the public appointment of the Saviour to His destined office. He is specially called "the Christ,"—*i.e.*, the anointed of God,—

* Doct. H. Euch., pp. 392—399. † Heb. viii. 3. ‡ Rev. xiii., 8.

in virtue of His being set apart, by the unction from on high, to His holy office. But when was He thus separated? At what period of His earthly sojourn did our Lord receive this visible sanction from His Father?

Now, every one of the four Evangelists begins the history of our Lord's ministerial career with His baptism in the Jordan; and the Baptist tells us that the descent of the Spirit, on that occasion, was the divine sanction to the ministerial character of Christ, and the ground of his own public recognition of Him in his preaching. "And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him. And I knew Him not: but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God."*

When John says, as he does often in this place, "I knew Him not," it cannot be supposed that he means that he did not know His person, for he was His kinsman. It seems rather that he did not know Him in His anointed character—as Him who was to baptize with the Holy Ghost. He means that, before this public and divine recognition of Jesus in His official and priestly character, he had not known Him in it. This has been the universal understanding of the passage in ancient and in recent times. In fact, there seems no room for any difference of opinion upon this point, for all divines consider that Jesus began His ministerial career at the age of thirty, and that the descent of the Holy Ghost at His baptism, was, as it were, His public call and qualification to the office, as was the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost the same for the apostles.

All these considerations, however, appear to weigh nothing with Mr. Wilberforce, in the scale against his preconceived opinions. The Scriptures are too often made to bend to a man's favorite sentiments, rather than the sentiments made to yield to

* John i., 32—4.

the Supreme authority. And such, we fear, was the case in the instance before us. The assumed sacrifice of bread and wine, on the part of Melchisedec, found a parallel in an equally assumed sacrifice of the same character by his great antitype, and the title of the Son of God to His priestly dignity, as well as entrance upon its discharge, is made to depend upon His celebration of this mystical oblation. The proper types in the thousand sacrifices under the law, are all ignored for the figment of a distempered imagination; and the sacrifice of the cross itself, which astonished angels and convulsed nature, is absolutely nothing in comparison of the wafer offering! I ask, are not these things true, when we are told, "Now we learn from Holy Scripture what was the nature of Melchisedec's sacrifice. He 'brought forth bread and wine, and he was the priest of the Most High God.' And we know when our Lord was consecrated to the like office; in that momentous night when the last Passover marked the close of the ancient dispensation. It was thus that our Lord *initiated* that priesthood of Melchisedec, which His apostles were ordained to perpetuate?"*

Such, then, are the views of Mr. Wilberforce, and such those of St. Paul, as to the characteristics of the two Melchisedecs, and of the sacrificial work which had to be accomplished by the latter, in fulfilment of the old ritual. The point of the assumed sacrifice in Genesis, *which is everything* with the Archdeacon, is taken no notice of at all by the apostle; while *the blessing* there mentioned, and the *for ever* of the psalmist, both of which are specially remarked upon by St. Paul, are comparatively insignificant in the theory of Mr. Wilberforce, save in so far as they may be enlisted in the cause of *the sacrifice*. How entirely the two stand asunder at first, in the comparison of official characteristics, is not more remarkable than the decided clashing and contradiction which, in the instance of our Lord's discharge of His antitypical functions, the apostle has to endure at the hands of

* Doct. H. Euch. pp. 304, 5.

the Archdeacon. It is hard to tell whether we should write more in sorrow or in anger in such a case; for while blindness, even judicial, should secure compassion, it is not easy to recognise the claims of the gentler feeling, where the evidences of wilfulness appear undoubted and many.*

The next point which claims our attention is the explanation which is given of Heb. xiii., 10: "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." As I have said above, I shall not go into the general question of sacrifice, nor even follow the Archdeacon into his theory (which may be tolerably correct for aught I know) of the similarity of, or distinctions between, the various kinds prescribed by the Mosaic ritual. What I am concerned with is his explanation of the above quoted verse; and though it were necessary for him to state and demonstrate his theory as a support for his interpretation, yet, if that interpretation can be shewn, independently, to be a fallacious one, it is not necessary for me to concern myself with his foundation; the substratum may be taken for what it is worth, independently of the superstructure sought to be based upon it.

The whole passage, of which the above verse forms a part, is as follows: "Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines. For it is a good thing that the heart be established with grace; not with meats, which have not profited them that have been occupied therein. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth therefore unto Him without the camp bearing His reproach."† Now, it is evident that, the reference in the eleventh verse, to the bodies of beasts burned without the camp, is to those sacrifices in the old law, wherein the

* See Appendix E.

† Heb. xiii. 9—13.

flesh of the animal sacrificed was not allowed to be partaken of by the officiating priest, but required to be consumed with fire. There are two or three different cases. First, there is the sin-offering of ignorance, (Levit. iv.) In two cases of sins of this character requiring atonement,—viz., when committed, either by the priest himself or by the congregation at large, a bullock was the required offering; of which it is said, after full directions to the officiating priest as to the discharge of his duties, "the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire."* And, although some relaxation of the burning without the camp took place in some instances, yet the rule as to non-participation was never dispensed with: "And no sin-offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire."†

Secondly, we have the case of the red heifer, the ashes of which were the chief ingredient in "the water of purification." She was also to be wholly consumed and not eaten. "And ye shall give her unto Eleazar, the priest, that he may bring her forth without the camp, and one shall slay her before his face, ... and one shall burn the heifer in his sight."‡ St. Paul refers to this directly elsewhere, when he is shewing the superiority of the sacrifice of Calvary to all the Jewish: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"§

But, probably, it was to the sacrifice on the great day of atonement that the apostle particularly referred in the passage under consideration; for as this was a day of special humiliation for all the tribes "for ever," in which every one was required "to afflict

* Levit. iv., 12. † Ibid. vi., 30. ‡ Num. xix., 3, 5. § Heb. ix., 13, 14.

his soul," so was it the day upon which the great expiation was made, and thus felt to be a "sabbath of rest." And the same directions are given as to the disposal of the victim, after the performance of the prescribed rites, as in the cases before named: "And the bullock for the sin-offering, and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins and their flesh."*

Now, here we have the great sacrifice to which Jesus Christ was the exact antitype; and it was perfectly natural, in an epistle whose "whole tenor shews that it was addressed to those who were just excluded from the home, which had hitherto been provided for them by their natural ritual; and were thus compelled either to abandon Christ, or to go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach:"—it was perfectly natural, I say, that it should be shewn that the great Christian sacrifice, in the blessing which it bestowed, did not, at all events, *fall below* that of its type in the abrogated system. "And here, therefore, we find a special enumeration of the particulars of Jewish service, and a proof that all of them had their accomplishment in the Christian covenant. And we find them summed up by reference to that new (not *communion*, but perfect) *sacrifice*, which was to compensate for exclusion from the continual sacrifices of the ancient temple."† For, as the sin-offering on the great day of atonement was, as it were, the completion of the year's round of services, and that which supplied all their deficiencies and obliterated their imperfections,—so the great sacrifice of Calvary is the perfection of *that* great Jewish atonement, by transferring the scene from earth to heaven, and *per se* rendering those who trust to it certainly accepted before God. Turn we now to the passage, to consider its exact significance.

And first let me say, that I think, with Mr. Wilberforce, that the common interpretation which makes the passage mean, "We

* Levit. xvi. 27.

† Doct. H. Euch., p. 308.

(Christians) have an altar (sacrifice), whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle (the Jewish priests; some say the Jewish people), is worse than no interpretation at all; for it makes the apostle declare, what is not true,—that the Jews had no right to eat of the Christian sacrifice, or in other words, had no right to participate in Christ. Surely there is no truth in this. I know it is always further explained by the remark, "that is, while they continue to serve the tabernacle;" but this is so evident a truism, that it emasculates the whole passage. Indeed, the entire explanation to which I have referred is beset with difficulties; for it not only gives an untrue or a jejune import to the words, but it also interposes the sentence, where it has no connection, with either what goes before or follows after it. In fine, I believe that no one who has thus sought the meaning of the place, has ever felt satisfied that what he made of it was good sense, sound theology, or apposite reasoning. At least I have never seen one who, in thus interpreting, has not necessarily sacrificed one of these, and felt dissatisfied himself with his own interpretation.

The Archdeacon, however, did not belong to that school of divines, which so understood the passage; but to those rather who apply it to the Eucharistic celebration, though with certainly no better success than their neighbours. Indeed, the difference of the two interpretations is more apparent than real, and every objection urged against the one will lie against the other. I freely confess, that, up to a very recent period, I had no idea of what the real meaning of the passage could be. What I now firmly believe to be its true solution, was mentioned to me by a valued clerical brother, some short time since; but I do not now know to whom the Church is indebted for what must be considered one of the most satisfactory solutions of a difficulty which theology has received in these latter days.

The solution, then, of which I speak, is arrived at by recollecting who are the parties concerned in this epistle. It is written *by* Paul, a Jew by nation and by birth, and, for a long time, in religion also. It is written *to* his "kinsmen according to the

flesh," to the Jewish people: to the converts, for their instruction, assurance, and comfort; to the opponents, for their information, conviction, and conversion. The epistle is addressed confessedly to the former, not to the latter class, though it must be also allowed that the explanations, exhortations, and assurances are those generally of a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" "to Israelites, to whom appertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenant, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose were the Fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came." There could, therefore, be no impropriety in the apostle, under such circumstances, addressing himself to those to whom he was writing, as one of themselves, and identifying himself with them in national peculiarities. Indeed, instances of this might be expected rather than not; and it is on this principle that the solution of which I have spoken is applied to this passage. It will be found that this makes every difficulty vanish, removes all incongruity, abruptness, and obscurity, and makes the whole simple, clear, and appropriate. The passage seems probably to have been written in consequence of the agitation of that oft-mooted question respecting eating of sacrifices, (1 Cor. viii.) Explained on the principle to which I have referred, the whole passage will stand thus:

"Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines; for it is a good thing that the heart be established with *grace*, not with *meats*, which have not profited those that have been occupied therein (those who have eaten). (Indeed, so far from *eating* being important,) we* (Jewish people) have an altar (a sacrifice) whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle (whereof the priests themselves are not allowed to eat, which would never be, if *eating* were an essential part of the service). For (instance) the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are *burned* without the camp (and

* The nominative is not emphatic. It is not expressed in the Greek. *Ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον, ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες.*

therefore could not be *eaten*, though this did not prevent the blessing being received by the faithful worshipper). Wherefore Jesus, also, that He might sanctify the people by (the sprinkling of) His own blood (and not by His flesh being carnally partaken of), suffered without the gate (as the sin-offering was always consumed there). Let us go forth, therefore, unto Him, without the camp, bearing His reproach;" an exhortation absolutely needful for the then times, and used, probably, in reference to the fact, that they who went out with the bullock and goat had to bear the stigma of uncleanness for a time. "And he that burneth them shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterwards he shall come into the camp."*

Here, then, by one of the most simple and natural methods, without changing a letter of the text, or altering even a point, we have a passage, which has baffled the genius of the learned for centuries, made clear and consistent. To allay the scruples of Jewish objectors, the case of their own former ritual is quoted against them, and the principle adduced shewn to apply to the Christian sacrifice. Thus the whole passage is one and unbroken; consisting of an illustration, its application, and an exhortation founded thereon. So much good is but seldom secured by so easy and evident an expedient (merely understanding Jews for Christians), and the Church is deeply indebted to the man who first suggested it.†

* Levit. xvi. 28.

† It would be by no means unreasonable to ask, if any other instances could be found of St. Paul thus classing himself with the Jews, nationally, neglecting all consideration of religious belief. The answer to such a question must be in the affirmative; though, of course, such instances are to be sought chiefly in his addresses to Jews. When the Apostle had been rescued from the mob in Jerusalem, by the interposition of the chief captain of the temple guard, as he stood on the steps of the tower of Antonio, he addressed the excited crowd in the Hebrew tongue, and said: "Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you. I am verily a man that is a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day," (Acts xxii., 3). So again, when on the following day he was brought before the Sanhedrim, and perceived that, by going further into particulars in this matter, he might divide his enemies, he did not hesitate to do so. The historian informs us: "When Paul perceived that the

We are now prepared to answer the question which is put to us—"Is there any scriptural testimony that it (the Eucharistic sacrifice) *was* a sin-offering?" I answer, most emphatically, No. With regard to the assertion, "The offering of flour was so far from being limited to the expression of thanks, that in all probability it was the common form in which the sin-offering was presented," I think it so much overstrained as to be probably the very contrary of the truth; for we shall find, that the offering ordinarily prescribed was, "a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin-offering." But in case of poverty, "if he be not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his trespass, which he hath committed, two turtledoves or two young pigeons, unto the Lord; one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering."* And it was only *in cases of extreme poverty* that it was allowed to the offender to bring "for his offering the tenth part of an ephah† of fine flour for a sin-offering," though only *a handful* was burnt on the altar, as a sin-offering; the remnant was the priest's, as a meat-offering."‡

one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question," (Acts xxiii., 6.)

So again, in Rom. iii., having shewn that the Jews had many advantages over the Gentiles, though they had sadly abused their privileges, as a Jew, he asks (v. 9.), "what then? are *we* (Jews) better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." Thus again, beyond all controversy, in Rom. iv., 1. "What shall we say then that Abraham, *our* father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?" So also in that remarkable and feeling passage above referred to, Rom. ix., 3: "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for *my* brethren, *my* kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites." And again he asks the question, "Hath God cast away His people? God forbid. For *I* also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin," (Rom. xi. 1.) And below (v. 13), he addresses the Gentiles, as a class of which he was not one, on the condition of the Jews, to which he belonged. "Now if the fall of them (the Jews) be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office: if by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are *my* flesh, and might save some of them." These instances must suffice. The principle is one of common sense and of every day occurrence. It is adopted by Stephen in his defence (Acts vii.)

* Levit. v., 7. † The tenth part of an ephah is an omer, rather more than six pints.

‡ See Levit. v., 6 to 13.

Now, though it may be strictly true that "the poor outnumber the rich," yet it is not true that the abject poor are a majority; indeed, they must have been a very insignificant section of the people in Palestine, "a land flowing with milk and honey," "the glory of all lands," whose monarchs at times thought gold alone worthy to form their drinking cups, and in whose capital "silver was nothing accounted of," being "as stones" in the street:§ the compulsory restitution, too, of all real property to its original owner, in the year of jubilee, must have very much tended to prevent the increase of such a class as that of abject poor. It is also to be remarked, that the cases referred to above were in the category of trespass or lesser sin-offerings, which the Archdeacon himself considers as very different in their nature from the sacrifice on the great day of atonement, to which that of our Lord more strictly applies. On the whole it is shewn, from this case, that fine flour might be made a sin-offering in matters of smaller import, though only then when nothing in the shape of an animal could be obtained.

But "that there is direct scriptural authority for asserting the Holy Eucharist to correspond to the Jewish sin-offering," has, I think, been proved an assertion without a foundation. The only proof attempted is that of Hebrews xiii., 10, to which, in my opinion, the most satisfactory reply has been given. I have shewn that that passage has not the slightest reference to the Christian system at all, much less to the Eucharistic supper; and that *the point* of the whole argument of the apostle is to shew, not only that the eating of the sacrifice, in any case, is not necessarily beneficial, but also that the Christian sacrifice, being the exact counterpart of the Jewish great sin-offering, *was not to be partaken of*. The passage, therefore, according to the view propounded, not only fails the Archdeacon, but actually lets him to the ground, by shewing that the point which he wished to establish could have no existence in the case of the antitypical sacrifice.

§ I Kings x., 21, 27.

Thus have I disposed of *all* the scriptural proofs, as they are called, of the Eucharistic sacrifice. For it is evidently to assume the whole matter in dispute to allege the prophecy of Malachi,—"in every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering,"—as establishing the point. But assumption is adopted, instead of proof, all through the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." The following is a good sample of this, as it is also of the general character of the whole book,—taking for granted that the principle was satisfactorily settled, that the priesthood of Jesus Christ was one instituted for the offering of the bread-and-wine sacrifice, and that the above-quoted passage of Malachi referred to it (though the only proof given of it is the assertion, "thus—*i.e.*, by the institution of the Eucharist—is that sacrifice effected, which was predicted as the sacrifice of the Gentile Church"), the Archdeacon proceeds:

"Incense, as we read in the Book of Revelation, is the type of prayer, and the parity of expression compels us to suppose that the pure offering must have its antitype also. Now, what can this be, but that *res sacramenti*, or reality, of which the bread in the Holy Eucharist is the channel and type? The 'Breaking of Bread,' therefore, was joined with prayer in the daily ritual of the first disciples, and this probably was the liturgy which was celebrated at Antioch, when St. Paul was called to the office of an apostle. Now, wherein would this service have been superior to the Jewish meat-offerings, unless it had been the reality, of which the ancient sacrifices were a typical representation? Yet such is the view always taken by the apostles respecting the relation between the Jewish law and the Christian ritual: they represent the law as the shadow, which had its reality in that 'perpetual sacrifice for sins,' 'the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.'* And in this comparison the Eucharistic sacrifice is represented as bearing its part. St. Paul contrasts the Christian Eucharist as well with the sacrifices of the Jewish law, as with the sacrificial rites of the heathen. He not only says, 'ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils;' but 'behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?" So that he parallels the daily offerings of the law with the Church's perpetual celebration of the Holy Eucharist."†

* Heb. x., 10, 12.

† Doct. H. Euch., pp. 305, 306.

Now, let us examine this quotation a little. In the first place, it is *assumed*, as I have said, that the prophesy in Malachi refers to the "Eucharistic sacrifice." Next, the mode of interpreting that passage is both novel and strange. Half of it is interpreted figuratively, the other half literally. "Incense is the type of prayer," we are told, correctly enough; and the "pure offering must have its antitype also." Undoubtedly it has. "Present your bodies," says the apostle, "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service."* And again: "By Him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name. To do good, and to communicate, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."† These are its antitypes, the true embodiment of religious truth. But the Archdeacon's idea is not that of an *antitype* for the "pure offering." He would make it a *reality* — the *juge sacrificium* of the cross — "*awful*," "*august*," "*mysterious*," "*efficacious*," "the *antitype* to the Jewish sacrifices," "the *reality*, of which they were *shadows*," "the thing offered, *the body of Christ*," "the *victim* and the *priest identical*," and the same as on Calvary. To look for an antitype for the "pure offering" is perfectly natural and consistent; but to call all this *its* antitype, is to use words without meaning. But this is, indeed, what is done from first to last in this book of poor Robert Wilberforce's; he seems to be lost in a maze of unmeaningnesses; he is bewildered by his own phraseology. Thus, in the passage before us, *incense*, the concrete, represents *prayer* the figurative; *a pure offering*, the concrete, should represent, as above shewn, *self-devotion*, the figurative. Here we have type and antitype according to what is said to be required; but the very next words of the Archdeacon, above quoted, throw the whole idea into confusion: "now, what can this be," he says, "but that *res sacramenti*, or reality, of which the bread in the Holy Eucharist is the channel or type?" So

* Heb. iii., 26. † Rom. xii., 1.

that the antitype of a concrete reality, is another concrete reality, while the whole is still further disguised and confounded by the introduction of another type in the sacred elements of the sacramental supper.

Again, briefly, in explanation or confirmation of the view propounded of Malachi's prophecy, it is remarked, "The Breaking of Bread, therefore," (do the capitals assume nothing?) "was joined with prayer in the daily ritual of the first disciples, and this, probably, was the liturgy which was celebrated at Antioch, when St. Paul was called to the office of an apostle." What grounds are there for all this assumption, which the modest "perhaps" scarcely qualifies? But, in the next sentence, the "perhaps" disappears, and the assumption is completed. The *fact* of the celebration of this liturgy is taken for granted; and it is asked, "Now wherein would this service have been superior to the Jewish meat-offerings, unless it had been the reality, of which the ancient sacrifices were a typical representation?" The superiority of this Christian service over the Jewish consists in this,—not that in itself it is anything better than that which it has superseded,—*it is not itself the reality*,—but because it brings to the mind of the worshipper the reality foreshadowed in the legal sacrifices, and is, towards the Deity, the remembrancer of the *finished work* of His own divine Son—of the one *final* sacrifice for sin. The view which is said to have been always taken by the apostles, "respecting the relation between the Jewish law and the Christian ritual," was not that which represents the law as the shadow, which had its reality in any "perpetual sacrifice for sins,"—if the word "perpetual" be used to signify the unceasing repetition of the sacrifice,—but in "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all*."* Nor do I see how the intrinsic value of the Eucharist, as "the reality," is proved, by referring to the apostle's statement, that the participation in a sacrificial feast, whether Christian, Jewish, or heathen,

* Heb. x., 10, 12.

is the virtual blending into one, the worshipped and the worshippers. Indeed, if this proves anything, it proves too much; for, whatever the apostle says of the one, he declares equally of the others. So that I do not see what would be gained for the East Riding, that is, the Popish theory, by St. Paul drawing a parallel between "the daily offering of the law" and "the Church's perpetual celebration of the Holy Eucharist," since he draws the same parallel between the Lord's table and the table of devils; though, to say the truth, I find no such parallel at all attempted by the apostle, who simply illustrates and enforces on the communicants of the Church, the union of Christ's people with Him and with one another, from the common opinion that existed, both amongst the Jews and the heathen, that participation in a sacrifice bound the worshipped and the worshippers together in one.

Thus have I examined and refuted every passage alleged in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," as supporting the Eucharistic sacrifice. If the doctrine were true, it would be indeed astounding that one of so much importance, second to none within the compass of the Christian faith, should have been left to hints and inferences; a doctrine, moreover, so obscure, that it could never have been discovered by the exercise of reason. The comparative silence of Scripture upon the subject is acknowledged by the Archdeacon; for, after some reasoning on the Church's system (which I cannot understand), and the assertion, "this must have been peculiarly felt, &c." (though what the feeling is I am unable to comprehend), he adds—"To this circumstance it is, probably, that we must attribute the comparatively little notice which the Eucharistic service receives in Holy Scripture." What the circumstance referred to is, I really cannot tell, unless it be that the Eucharistic sacrifice was too well understood to make any explanation at all of it necessary to the Jewish people; but this "comparatively little notice" does not prevent our being told that "not a word is said there which militates against its efficacy; and we see it foreshadowed in the law, predicted by Malachi, instituted by our Lord, and referred to in the epistles to the Corinthians and

the Hebrews,"—which, as I think, I have *proved*, are all pure assumptions, without support in the Word of God, and attempted to be established by inconclusive reasoning and false deductions. I will say no more here, but give the following astounding assertion, for the belief of which there is nothing save the audacity with which it is made:—"That the priesthood of Melchisedec was exercised like other priesthoods, through the offering which it presented, and, consequently, that its operation embraced all those means by which our Lord's perpetual presence was bestowed upon His people, *was too obvious to require enforcement.*"*

We now weigh anchor, and, having spread our sails, are wafted from the harbour of Scripture security into the wide and wild sea of ecclesiastical history, almost like a mariner, in the midst of the Atlantic, without compass or rudder. Whatever differences of opinion there may be as to the meaning of particular passages in the Word of God, of one thing we are certain—all are true. Again: whatever variety of expression may be used, and by how many soever writers, we know that they were all influenced by the same Spirit, and, therefore, meant the same thing. We may, then, on both these accounts, feel confidence in trusting to the Bible. But the same cannot be predicated of the Fathers. They were not inspired, and, being liable to error, we are not always sure that they meant truth. Again: they are many; and in some things we may use the old maxim, *tot homines, quot sententiæ*. "Many men, many opinions," is as true of the Fathers on the subject of religious truth and biblical criticism, as it is true of other men on other

* It is worthy of notice, that Josephus saw no *sacrifice* in this act of Mechisedec, but, what is above suggested, a provision for the wants of weary warriors. His words are—"Ἐχορήγησε ὁ Μελχισεδέκης τῷ Ἀβράμου στρατιῷ ξένια, καὶ πολλὴν ἀφθονίαν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων παρέσχε, l. i. c. 11. [vol. 1. p. 32. Amstel. &c. 1726.] Nor could cardinals Cajetan or Bellarmine see what the quondam Archdeacon of the East Riding saw so plainly. Cajetan says, "Nihil hic scribitur de sacrificio, sed de prolatione seu extractione, quam Josephus dicit factam ad reficiendos victores," (Cajet. in Gen. 14). And Bellarmine remarks, "At nos non negamus data illa in cibum Abraæ et Sociis, sed dicimus fuisse prius Deo oblata et consecrata, et tum data hominibus ut de sacrificio participarent."—Bellarm. de Miss. l. i. c. 6. D. [vol. 3. p. 419. col. 2. Prag. 1721.] In Payne's Discourse on the Sacrifice of the Mass.

subjects. The dove must return to the ark before she can find rest for the sole of her foot.

But, while we launch out into the tossed sea before us with such feelings as these, we neither shrink from the voyage nor doubt its termination. Though the Fathers did use language, on sacred subjects, often approaching to, sometimes overstepping, the bounds of soberness and truth, yet there is in their writings much that is exceedingly valuable. Their remains are a blessing to the Church. For, although some *many* isolated passages might be found which, by being bound down to a rigid literal interpretation, when they were only the expressions of pious rhapsody, might be made to teach error, yet even these are always possible of correction by the sober statements or reasonable interpretation, with which they are generally accompanied. Those who advocate Romish doctrine may claim the Fathers as supporting their views; but it is a claim without a solid foundation, which needs only to be examined to be disallowed. One simple, common-sense rule is all that is necessary for application to the passages produced: those that are poetic, imaginative, and rhapsodical, are to be explained by the simple, didactic, and sober—not *vice versa*. If this test were generally applied to those writings of the ancient Church which have descended to us, it would be found that the primitive Fathers were, far more frequently than is now imagined, sound theologians, not shamed by comparison with an equal number of those of modern days.

We come now to consider the patristical authority, which is adduced to prove the reality and character of the Eucharistic oblation. The case is stated as follows by the Archdeacon:

"But what proof have we that the statements of Scripture are to be thus interpreted?...This question will be best answered by adopting the course which was taken previously, and considering what are the alternatives of which the case admits. One of these is to deny that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice at all. Another is to admit that it is a sacrifice, but to affirm that the thing presented is not the offering of Christ, but the devotion of the communicants. A third is to suppose that the *sacramentum* only, that is, the bread and wine, and not the *res sacramenti*, is the thing offered. Each of these notions has been

entertained, but the second, which affirms the Holy Eucharist to be a sacrifice, but states that the thing offered is only the devotion of the worshippers, is merely a *nominal* answer, and resolves itself in reality into the first. For why should this ordinance be called the Eucharistic Sacrifice, except because its sacramental character bears some part in the offering? Otherwise it has no more title to the name of sacrifice than every act of prayer or praise. Whether the *sacramentum* were offered, or the *res sacramenti*, we might fitly call it a *sacramental* offering; but the name is inapplicable, if nothing is intended but that which is common to all religious offices. Why else do we not speak of a baptismal* sacrifice, since the devotion of the worshippers may equally be looked for in that sacrament also?...There remained, therefore, in reality, but three systems, which it is possible to entertain. Either the Holy Eucharist is not a sacrifice at all, or if it be, the thing offered is either merely the *sacramentum*, or it includes the *res sacramenti* also. Those who entertain the notions of Zuinglius and Calvin cannot adopt the last opinion, because they either deny that there exists any *res sacramenti* at all, or deny, at all events, its presence in the ordinance. Their common and most consistent course has been to deny that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice at all; but there have not been wanting parties who have professed to attach great importance to the Eucharistic sacrifice, and yet have maintained that bread and wine is all which is offered. Now, what is the judgment of the ancient Church respecting these three opinions? Is the Holy Eucharist a sacrifice, and is the thing offered the *sacramentum* only, or the *res sacramenti* also? In reference to the first opinion, it may be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that no doctrine of the Christian religion is affirmed with more unanimity† by all ancient writers, than the truth of

* It must be a sufficient answer to this question to reply that, in this view of a sacrifice (for which, as shewn in the text, there is the amplest scriptural authority), the baptismal water and service *are* so called. Within a few days, in the course of my own very limited reading, I have found two instances, and, I doubt not, many more might be found by seeking. The first is that given above, from St. Ephrem, where he says, speaking of baptism, "A symbol of the Spirit is in it, yea, a type of the Holy Spirit, who is mingled in water, that it may become a *propitiation*, and is blended with bread, that it may become a sacrifice." And St. Augustine says, speaking of the same sacrament, "Holocausto Dominicæ passionis, quod eo tempore offert quisque pro peccatis suis, quo ejusdem passionis fide dedicatur, et Christianorum fidelium nomine baptizatus imbuitur."—Augustine ad Roman. Expos. cap. 19, tom. 3. apud Waterland. So that the Archdeacon's censures fall first on the inspired writers for adopting such figurative modes of speech, and next upon the Fathers for following their example.

† "Apud veteres Patres, ut quod res est libere fateamur, de sacrificio corporis Christi in Eucharistia incruento frequens est mentio, quæ dici vix potest quantopere

the Eucharistic sacrifice. . . . It can hardly be disputed that there is no ancient writer, whose subject leads him to speak of the Holy Eucharist, who does not declare it to be a sacrifice, who does not call the place an altar at which it is offered, and the person by whom it is presented a priest."*

It cannot, indeed, be disputed that all the ancient Fathers call the Eucharistic service a *sacrifice*, as they do all other services; though there were reasons why this was more appropriately called so than others. It was the custom, even of the inspired writers, and that, too, under the law, to apply the names *oblation* and *sacrifice* to all services of a character acceptable to God. And I think the assertion above quoted, from the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,"—viz., that to affirm that the thing presented is the devotion of the communicants is but a *nominal* answer, and is equivalent to denying that the Eucharist is any sacrifice at all, is far from correct, whether we consider the language of inspiration or that of the early Fathers. In order, then, to clear the ground, before we go into the consideration of the language of the writers of the first ages, we will consider what scriptural authority they had for speaking of *any* Christian services as sacrifices. The particular case of the Eucharist we will consider afterwards.

We find, then, the names of *sacrifice* and *oblation* given in a metaphorical and general manner, in various ways:—1. By David, to a true repentance and sorrow for sin: "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise," (*Psalm* li., 17.) And again, to the outward expression of thanksgiving: "We render unto God the *calves* of our lips," (*Hosea* xiv., 2.) "We offer unto Him thanksgiving," (*Psal.* l., 14.) Or, as in the passage above quoted, "We offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually," (Heb. xiii., 15.) Where the metaphorical expression is preserved also, through the fol-

quorundam alioqui doctorum hominum ingenia exercuerit, torserit, vexaverit."—Bishop Morton in Mede. Ep. lxxi.

* Doct. H. Euch., pp. 316—319.

lowing verse, and applied to works of charity and benevolence; of which the apostle adds—"for with such sacrifices God is well pleased," (v. 16.) He speaks similarly to the Philippians, on the same subject, when he calls their charity "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God," (*Phil.* iv., 18.) And, in another place, he calls their faith a sacrifice, and himself offered upon it (*Phil.* ii., 17.)* But St. Paul himself goes even far beyond this; for he calls preaching the Gospel a Λειτουργία and Ἱερουργία, and the effect of that preaching in the conversion of the Gentiles he calls προσφορὰ, (*Rom.* xv., 16;)† words which are made much of by the Archdeacon, when used by Clement and others, and supposed to be spoken of the Eucharist. The same phraseology is adopted by St. Peter, also, and applied to works of godliness, which he calls "spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ, (1 *Pet.* ii., 5;)" for the offering of which he assigns to all Christians the office of a "holy priesthood;" on which account St. John, also, in the Apocalypse, styles true Christians "priests unto God," (*Rev.* i., 6.) Now, in all these passages, it is manifest that the terms "sacrifice," "offering," &c., are used in a loose and metaphorical manner,—*i.e.*, without the strictness with which it is applied to *material* offering.‡

* Ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν.

† Εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπροσδεκτὸς, ἡγιασμένη ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

‡ Some theologians consider that the terms "sacrifice," "oblation," &c., are *strictly* applied when used of prayer, praises, and such services, which are directly *offered* to God. "The sacrifice of obedience," says Bishop Lany, "is metaphorical; that is, God accepts it as well as if it had been a sacrifice—that is, something given to Himself. But the sacrifice of praise is proper, without a metaphor; the nature of it accomplished by offering something to God, in acknowledgment of Him. The honour which God receives from our obedience, differs from that of a sacrifice; for that is only of consequence and by argumentation; that is, it suits with the nature and will of God; as we say, good servants are an honour to their masters, by reflection. But the honour by sacrifice is of direct and special intendment; it hath no other use, and is a distinct virtue from all other acts of obedience, and of a different obligation.—Though God hath the honour of obedience and a virtuous life, if we deny him the honour of a sacrifice besides, we rob him of his due, and a greater sacrilege we cannot commit.—This is

Now, instead of being surprised or inconvenienced by the phraseology which has been adduced, we cannot well conceive anything more natural in the mouths of those whose whole religious system was one of endless "offering," and sacrificial observances; to whose minds, if not eyes, from birth to death, daily, nay, almost hourly, some oblation was present. Had we found works professing to have been written by persons so situated to others similarly circumstanced, and *not* containing such allusions and adapted expressions, we should have considered such absence a strong presumption against the genuineness of the productions. What necessity, then, nay, what propriety can there be, to force interpretations upon passages which they cannot be made to bear without violence? Why should we do with the Fathers what we feel we could not do with the passages above adduced from the inspired writers?

Confessing, therefore, that the primitive Fathers did use the terms sacrifice, offering, or oblation of the Eucharist, we will next proceed to consider the sense in which those terms were applied to that religious ordinance. And here I do not know that I could do better than give the summary, which has been given by Waterland, of both the origin of the names, and of the change which took place in them in the time of Cyprian.*

"The name of *oblation* may, I think, be fairly carried up as high as to Clemens of Rome, who, upon the lowest computation, wrote his famous epistle as early as the year 96. The more common date is 70,

robbing God of the service itself, to which the other, dedicated for His service, are but accessary." Dr. Dan. Waterland remarks sensibly upon this—"This very acute and knowing divine had not learned to call every spiritual sacrifice a metaphorical sacrifice; for he admits of prayers and praises, and the like religious services, as true and proper sacrifices. I conceive, further, that even obedience, formally considered as respecting God, and as a tribute offered to him,—though it has other views besides, in which it is no sacrifice at all,—is as properly sacrifice as the other, and so judged St. Austin." I have not thought it necessary, in the text, either to keep separate my instances, or to shape my phraseology, to this less popular distinction. It is necessary, however, to bear it in mind, in considering the meaning of the Fathers, when they speak of a *true* sacrifice.

* As to this change, and Cyprian's part in it, consult Appendix E, according to Dr. Pusey's acknowledgment.

or thereabout: but a learned and considerate writer,* who very lately has re-examined the chronology of that epistle, has, with great appearance of probability, brought it down to A.D. 96: and there I am willing to rest it.

"Clemens speaks of the *oblations* and *sacred functions* of the Church, referring, very probably, to the *Eucharistical service*;† neither can he without some violence be interpreted to mean anything else. In another place, he still more plainly refers to the same, where he says, 'It would be no small sin in us, should we cast off those from the episcopal function, who holily and without blame *offer the gifts*.'‡ Here he expressly speaks of gifts *offered* (that is, of *oblation*), and by *sacerdotal* hands. The *gifts* were brought to the altar, or communion table, by the *people*, and were recommended to God's acceptance by the officiating bishop, or presbyter. So there was first a kind of *lay oblation*, and next a *sacerdotal* oblation of the same *gifts* to God. Those *gifts* consisted partly of *alms* to the poor, and partly of *oblations*, properly so called, to the *Church*; and out of these last was usually taken the *matter* of the Eucharist, the *bread* and *wine*.§ The *oblation*, as I before hinted, was twofold; hence the whole service of the Eucharist came to be called the *oblation*: and to communicate, or to administer, in Church language, was to *offer*. There was a *third* kind of *oblation*|| which came up afterwards, in the third century: or, to speak more accurately, the *commemoration*, which was always a part of the Eucharistical service, came by degrees to be called an *oblation* (but not within the first two centuries, so far as I can find), and then commenced a kind of *third oblation*; not a *new thing*, but an old service under a *new name*.

"Justin Martyr, though he does not directly call the Eucharist by the name of *oblation*, yet he does obliquely, where he says, that the

* Lardner, Credibility of Gosp. Hist. part ii. vol. i. pp. 50, 62.

† Πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν . . . τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργείας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι . . . οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν, εὐπρόσδεκτοί εἰσι καὶ μακάριοι. Clem. Rom. Ep. c. xl. p. 164.

‡ Ἁμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενέγκοντας τὰ δῶρα, τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν. c. xliv. p. 178. Compare Johnson's Unbl. Sacrifice, part i. p. 75, 78, &c.

§ See Bingham. Eccles. Antiq. b. xv. c. 2, sec. 1, 2. Deylingius, Observ. Miscellan. p. 301. Constitut. Apostol. lib. viii. c. 27, 30. L'Arroque, Hist. of the Eucharist, part i. ch. iv. p. 30, &c.

|| Of the *third oblation*, or *threefold* oblation, see L'Arroque, Hist. of the Euch. part i. c. 8. Sam. Basnag. Annal. tom. 1, p. 371. Pfaffius, Dissert. de Oblat. Vet. Eucharist. p. 283, 293.

oblation of *fine flour*, under the law, was a type of the *bread* of the *Eucharist*;* and where he speaks of the Eucharistical elements as being *offered* to *God*.† Elsewhere he speaks plainly of the *lay-offering*, brought by the people to the administrator:‡ and I presume, he is to be understood of an offering to be presented *to God* by the hands of the minister, brought to the minister in order to be recommended by him to the *Divine* acceptance.

The reference to this act of presenting their gifts on the part of the people, is constant and clear for several centuries. It is probable that the apostle alludes to it in 1 Cor. xi., as also does Clemens Romanus in the place quoted by the Archdeacon, where he not only mentions these *προσφοραὶ* in connection with "liturgies,"§ but also commends those who make these "offerings" regularly.‖ The apostolic canons, which are falsely attributed to this Father, speak of these offerings as "brought to the altar for sacrifice." Ignatius, in his epistle to the Smyrneans, says, that without the bishop, it is lawful *Οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε προσφέρειν οὔτε θυσίαν προσκομίζειν*, &c. Justin Martyr also mentions these offerings as accompanied with prayer and thanksgiving, and as the way in which Christians worshipped the Creator, instead of the bloody sacrifices, libations, and incense that were offered by others;¶ "and these," says he, "we account the proper way of

* Ἡ *τῆς σεμιδάλεως προσφορὰ . . . τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας.* Just. Dial. p. 119. Jebb. 220. Thirlby.

† *Προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας.* Just. Dial. p. 120. Jebb. alias 220.

‡ Ἔπειτα *προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ*, &c. . . . Ἄρτος *προσφέρεται, καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ. καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ, λέγων τὸ* Ἀμήν. Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 96, 98.

§ *Κατὰ καιροὺς τεταγμένους τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ Λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι (ἐκέλευσεν ὁ δεσπότης.)* Clemens Ep. 1. ad Corinth. p. 85.

‖ *Οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν, εὐπρόσδεκτοί τε καὶ μακάριαι.* Ib. p. 86.

¶ *Τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς σεβόμενοι ἀνενδεῆ αἱμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν καὶ θυμιαμάτων,—λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πᾶσιν,—μόνην ἀξίαν αὐτοῦ τιμὴν ταύτην παραλαβόντες οὐ πυρὶ δαπανᾶν ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις προσφέρειν.*—Justin. Martyr. Apolog. 2.

honouring him, not by consuming his gifts in the fire, but by thus offering them for the poor, and for ourselves." Irenæus says, "The Church offers to God, who affords us food, the first-fruits of his gifts, and the first-fruits of his creatures, not as if He wanted, but that we may be grateful;"* where it is evident that the oblation of Christ in the Eucharist is not meant; for "the offering to God of his own creatures," and "the first-fruits of his creatures,"† can be no other than of bread and wine, and the like; and hence he proves against the Marcionites, that Christ was‡ truly the Son of the Creator and maker of the world, because that His creatures were offered in the Eucharist. St. Cyprian, condemning and blaming some of the rich women who came to the sacrament without bringing these oblations, "Thou comest," says he, "into the Lord's house without a sacrifice, and takest part of that sacrifice which the poor hath offered."§ St. Augustine insists upon the same thing, and bids them "offer the oblations which are consecrated upon the altar; a man who is able ought to blush if he eat of another's oblation‖ without offering himself."

Now, it must be sufficiently manifest that all these passages can have no reference to the mystical sacrifice to which Mr. Wilberforce and the Romanists would apply them: the application of them is clear and consistent. They are used of the offerings which were presented at the altar on the Sabbath, or at other times; some daily, some weekly, some monthly,¶ as the case might be, and which have their representative in "our alms and obla-

* Ecclesia . . . offert Deo, ei qui nobis alimenta præstat, primitias suorum munerum . . . primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis; non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi, nec ingrati sint. Iren. advers. Hæres. l. 4. c. 32.

† Primitias earum quæ sunt ejus creaturarum offerentes, . . . offerens ei ex gratiarum actione ex creatura ejus. Ib. c. 34.

‡ Quomodo autem constabit eum panem in quo gratiæ actæ sunt . . . si non ipsum fabricatoris mundi filium dicant. Ib.

§ In Dominicum sine sacrificio venis, quæ partem de sacrificio, quod pauper obtulit, sumis. Cypr. de Oper. et Eleemos.

‖ Oblationes quæ in altari consecrantur offerte, erubescere debet homo idoneus, si de aliena oblatione communicet. Aug. Serm. 13 de Temp.

¶ See Bingham, book 15, c. 2, ss. 1, 3.

tions" (*i.e.*, the sacramental elements), named in our own communion service.

We come now to consider the second case. Waterland writes as follows:

"Irenæus, of the same century, makes frequent mention of the *oblation* of the Eucharist, understanding by it the *whole* service as performed by clergy and people, according to their respective parts or provinces.* He supposes the oblation made *to God*, made by the *Church*, in and by the proper officers: and though the *oblation*, strictly speaking, according to its primary signification, means only one part of the service, or two (viz. the people's bringing their *offerings* to the altar, and the administrator's presenting *the same* to God), yet from this part or parts of the service, the whole solemnity took the name of the *oblation* at that time, and such name became very common and familiar afterwards. For since the very *matter* of the Eucharist was taken out of the *oblations* received from the people, and solemnly *offered* up afterwards to God by the ministers, it was very natural to give the name of *oblation* to the whole solemnity.

"Tertullian, speaking of the devil, as imitating the mysteries of the Church, takes notice, among other things, of his instructing his votaries to *baptize* and to celebrate the *oblation of bread*:† as much as to say, that they also had their Eucharist in their way; *oblation* being here the name for the whole service. In another place, he uses the single word *offer*, for the whole action of administering and receiving the communion.‡ Elsewhere he makes mention of *oblations* for the *dead*; and at the *anniversaries* of the *martyrs*:§ and by *oblations* he could intend nothing but the *Eucharistical solemnities* celebrated on those days."‖

* Novi Testamenti novam docuit *oblationem*, quam *ecclesia* ab apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo *offert Deo*, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat, primitias suorum munerum, &c.—(Iren. lib. iv. c. 17.) Ecclesiæ *oblatio*, quam Dominus docuit *offerri* in universo mundo, purum sacrificium repertum est, &c.—Non genus oblationum reprobatum est; oblationes enim et illic, *oblationes* autem et hic. Hanc *oblationem* ecclesia sol ampuram *offert fabricatori*, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione, ex creatura ejus.

† Tinguit et ipse quosdam . . . . celebrat et *panis oblationem*. Tertull. de Præscript. c. xl.

‡ Ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et *offers*, et *tinguis*, et sacerdos es tibi solus. Tertull. de Exhort. Cast. c. vii. Conf. de Veland. Virg. c. ix.

§ *Oblationes* pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus. Tertull. de Coron, c. iii. Conf. de Exhort. Cast. c. xi.

‖ See Bingham, book xxiii. c. 3, s. 12, 13. Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan.

Now we shall see that *this* idea of a true sacrifice, both in the *thing* and in its *nature*, was the same as that of the Fathers in the ages preceding Augustine. Thus Irenæus, even when speaking of the Eucharist, says, "God wills us to offer unceasingly a gift at His altar, namely, our prayers and oblations, which are directed to the heavenly altar."* Surely he could have had no idea of a true and propitiatory sacrifice of a more excellent nature in that ordinance, or he would not have spoken thus. Justin Martyr also, in total oblivion of any sacrifice of such a character as is now insisted upon, says, "Prayers and thanksgivings are the only perfect and agreeable sacrifices, well pleasing unto God."† Thus also Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of prayer, calls it "a good and holy sacrifice;" adding, "the sacrifice of the Church is the words of devout souls."‡ Tertullian, in like manner, explains the prophecy of Malachi, of "glorification, benediction, praise, hymns and prayer, proceeding from a pure heart."§ And, indeed, he enumerates among propitiatory sacrifices and oblations, "*mortifications, humiliations, contritions, fastings*, and *general strictness of life*." The eccentric and uncertain Origen, in his commentary upon Leviticus, is full of the same doctrine. And Gregory Nazianzen said of St. Basil, after his death, that "he was in heaven, offering sacrifices and praying;"‖ adding elsewhere, with respect to himself, that he *sacrificed* his Easter discourse, and hoped in heaven "to sacrifice unto God, upon His altar, sacrifices well pleasing unto Him."¶

St. Chrysostom, in his commentary on Genesis, says, "Prayer is a great sacrifice, and a perfect oblation."** And again, on St. Matthew, he adds of the catechumens, "They who are not initiated offer their oblation and sacrifice,—*i. e.*, prayer and praise."†† St. Ambrose also testifies to the same opinion. "Wisdom," says

* Vult nos quoque sine intermissione offerre munus ad altare: est ergo altare in cœlis, illuc enim preces et oblationes nostræ diriguntur. Iren. l. 4. advers. Hæres. c. 33. [ut supra, p. 251. col. 2, 252. col. 1.]

† Contra. Tryphonem. ‡ Strom., lib. 7.

§ Contra Marcion, lib. iii., c. 22, and lib. iv., c. 1. ‖ Orat. 20. ¶ Orat. 42.

** Hom. 9. †† Hom. 16.

he, "is a very good sacrifice, and faith and virtue a good oblation. Prayer itself is a sacrifice."* To all which Augustine adds, "We offer unto God bloody sacrifices, when we suffer unto blood for His truth."† When, therefore, we find the terms sacrifice, offering, or oblation, applied to the most solemn of all services of the Christian Church, we surely must be little surprised at such application. Nor is it easy for us to mistake the sense of the writer. Indeed, when the term is used of and applied to the whole body of communicants, it can have no other meaning. Whatever pretence might be made for insisting upon a further and fuller significance for the word, when applied to the officiating minister, it is evident that this is the extent to which the meaning can be pushed, when used of the whole Church in its most solemn service.

But there are other and yet more remarkable circumstances, proving that this was *the* idea which the members of the ancient Church had respecting its sacrifices, and which not only shew that the Fathers had no such idea as that of the Popish ‡ sacrifice of the mass, but absolutely exclude it. Numerous instances of this are found in connexion with the apologies which were addressed to the Roman emperors by the Christian apologists. The Jews and heathens were constantly taunting the Christians with being atheists, because they had no temples, no sacrifices, no altars, on which to offer to their God. Now, the answers which are always given to these charges certainly ignore any material sacrifice at all, and declare the only one which the Church possessed to be of a spiritual character, consisting of prayers and thanksgivings. Thus we find Justin Martyr declaring, "We are not atheists," as they were charged to be, because they had not the visible worship of sacrifices, "but we worship the Maker of all things, who needs not blood, or libations, or incense, with the word of prayer and thanksgiving, giving Him

* Ambrose de Fug. Sæc. c. 8. † De Civit. lib. x. c. 4.

‡ There is no longer any need to speak of the East Riding theory. It has all along been apparent that there was no difference between it and the popish; and now it seems the Archdeacon has made his peace with Rome.

praise as much as we can, and counting this the only honour worthy of Him ;* and we are persuaded He needeth no material oblations from men.'† And in another place he says, ' Prayers and praises made by good men, are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God.'‡ ' We are charged by some with atheism,' says Athenagoras, ' who measure religion only by the way of sacrifices ; and what do ye tell me of sacrifices which God wanteth not, though we ought to bring Him an unbloody sacrifice, and to offer Him a rational worship ;' where the rational worship explains the meaning of the unbloody sacrifice. Tertullian, in his apology answering that charge, that Christians did not sacrifice for the emperors, ' It follows,' says he, ' by the same reason, we do not sacrifice for others, because neither do we do it for ourselves :'‖ but in answer to this, he declares how Christians prayed for the emperor, c. 30. And in another place he says, ' they sacrificed for the emperor's health ;' that is, ' with a pure prayer, as God has commanded,¶ and I offer to God,' says he, in the same apologetic speaking against other sacrifices, ' a rich and greater sacrifice than he commanded the Jews, prayer from a chaste body, from an innocent soul, proceeding from the Holy Spirit.'** ' This is the host to be offered,' says Minutius Felix,

*Ἄθεοι μὲν οὐκ ἐσμὲν, τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς σεβόμενοι ἀνενδεῆ αἱμάτων, καὶ σπονδῶν, καὶ θυμιαμάτων,—λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας —ὅση δύναμις αἰνοῦντες μόνην ἀξίαν αὐτοῦ τιμὴν ταύτην παραλαβόντες. Justin. Martyr. Apolog. 2. [Apolog. 1. n. 13.] [p. 50. Par. 1742.]

† Ἀλλ' οὐ δέεσθαι τῆς παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ὑλικῆς προσφορᾶς προειλήφαμεν τὸν Θεόν. Ibid. [p. 48.]

‡ Εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοι εἰσὶ τῷ Θεῷ. Dialog. cum Tryph. [Ibid. p. 210.]

§ Ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἐπικαλούντων ἡμῖν τὴν Ἀθεότητα—μετροῦντες τὴν εὐσέβειαν θυσιῶν νόμῳ—τί δὲ μοὶ ὁλοκαυτώσεων, ὧν μὴ δεῖται ὁ Θεός ; καὶ τοι προσφέρειν δέον ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν. Athenag. Legat. pro Christ. [Apud Justin. Ibid. p. 289.]

‖ Pro imperatoribus sacrificia non penditis, sequitur ut eadem ratione pro aliis non sacrificemus, quia nec pro nobis ipsis. Tertul. Apologet. adversus gentes, c. 10. [p. 10. Par. 1695.]

¶ Sacrificamus pro salute Imperatoris, *i.e.* pura prece sicut Deus præcepit. Idem ad Scapul. [p. 69.]

** Ei offero opimam et marjorem hostiam quam ipse mandavit, orationem de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de spiritu sancto profectam. Ib. Apol. c. 30. [p. 27.]

'a good mind, a pure soul, a sincere conscience; these are our sacrifices, these are the sacred things of God,' in answer to their not having altars and shrines;* which objection, made also by Celsus, is after the same manner replied to by Origen: 'Our altars are the mind of every one that is righteous, from whence is truly sent up sweet-smelling sacrifices;' to wit, 'prayers from a pure conscience.'† Lactantius, when he proposes to speak of sacrifice, shows how unsuitable an external one is to God, and that the proper sacrifice to Him 'is praise and an hymn: blessing alone is His sacrifice. We ought, therefore, to sacrifice unto God by word: the chief way of worshipping God is thanksgiving out of the mouth of a just man directed to God.'"‡

Thus it will be seen that these worthy apologists always acknowledge the truth of the accusation against them, that they had no sacrifice or altars, properly so called, and in the ordinary acceptation of the terms. But if they had had such an idea as that the Eucharist was really the *truest* sacrifice, and the communion table§ a *real* altar, what would have been more easy than to have explained the nature of their sacrifice, and, moreover, its superiority over all others, Jewish or heathen? It is perfectly unaccountable that those who have shewn themselves such skilful

* Cum sit litabilis hostia bonus animus et pura mens, et sincera conscientia—— hæc nostra sacrificia, hæc Dei sacra sunt.—Minuc. Octav. sc. delubra et aras non habemus. Ib.

† Βωμοὶ μέν εἰσιν ἡμῖν τὸ ἑκάστου τῶν δικαίων ἡγεμονικὸν, ἀφ' οὗ ἀναπέμπεται ἀληθῶς καὶ νοητῶς εὐώδη θυμιάματα προσευχαὶ ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως καθαρᾶς. Origen. contra Celsum. l. 8. p. 389. [vol. 1. p. 755. Par. 1733.]

‡ Nunc de Sacrificio ipso pauca dicemus,—sacrificium laus et hymnus—hujus sacrificii sola benedictio; verbo ergo sacrificare oportet Deo—summus igitur colendi Dei ritus est, ex ore justi hominis ad Deum directa laudatio. Lactanctius de vero cultu. l. 6. sec. 25. [vol. 1. p. 436. Wirceb. 1783.]

§ That the ancients used the name of table or altar indifferently is shewn by Bingham (bk. 8, cap. vi. ss. 12—14), and that they were made of wood and moveable (s. 15). It is probable that, about the time of Constantine, they began to be of stone; and Gregory Nyssen, in his discourse on baptism, speaks of the altar in his church being nothing but common stone, till consecrated; "but after it is consecrated," saith he, "and dedicated to the service of God, it becomes a holy table, an immaculate altar, which may not be promiscuously touched by all, but only by the priests in the time of divine service." The Council of Epone, in France, in 509, made the first decree, that all altars should thereafter be of stone. Bingham *ut supra*.

defenders of the truths of the Christian religion, should not only have forgotten to urge what must have been a perfect answer to this objection if they had believed in such a sacrifice, but also have denied that they had one. Nor will it do to say that the early Christians were wont to hide the *mysteries* from vulgar gaze, which will account for their not urging the Eucharistic sacrifice; for we have, in one of the apologies, a full description of the ceremonies used in the celebration, though without one word on the sacrifice.* Indeed, these objections and replies meet us in a way that leaves no room at all for doubt; for Julian the apostate, who had himself professed the Christian religion for years, and must have understood its doctrines, made the same charge, of the absence of all sacrifices and altars ;† while Cyril's answer acknowledges the charge, but boasts of spiritual and mental sacrifices, which are far better.‡ Instead of corporeal and visible sacrifices, "We offer," says he, "for a sweet savour, faith, hope, charity, righteousness, and praise."§ Now it really does seem unaccountable, and almost incomprehensible, that there should have been such an entire forgetfulness of the great sacrifice—*true, real, propitiatory*—for the sins of both living and dead, as we are told that of the Eucharist is, if there had been any idea extant that it was such. I think it must strike every one of common sense, and be acknowledged by every one of common honesty, that the mention never was made, because no such idea existed, When, therefore, the Fathers apply the term sacrifice or oblation to the sacramental celebration, it is frequently to the whole service as an offering of praise, and to the prayers and thanksgivings connected with it.

* See Justin Martyr's second Apology *ad finem* (Appendix G).

† *παράγειν δὲ ἱερεῖα βωμῷ καὶ θύειν παρητήσασθε.* Julian. apud Cyril. Alexand. contra Jul. 1. 10. p. 345. [343.] [Lut. 1638.]

‡ *Θύομεν δὲ μακρῷ κρεῖττον ἡμεῖς νυνὶ ἢ ἐκεῖνοι πάλαι——θυσίας τὰς πρὸς ἡμῶν πνευματικὰς δηλονότι καὶ νοητάς.* Ibid. p. 343. [345.]

§ *προσκομίζομεν γὰρ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας τῷ Θεῷ πάντα τρόπον ἐπιεικείας, πίστιν, ἐλπίδα, ἀγάπην, δικαιοσύνην—ἀκαταλήκτους δοξολογίας, καὶ τὰς ἑτέρας τῶν ἀρετῶν.* Ib.

I now proceed to consider the third important sense in which the terms were applied, peculiarly to the same holy ordinance.

"We have seen proofs sufficient of the name of *oblation* for the first two centuries. But it is observable, that all this time we meet only with oblation of *gifts*, or *first fruits*, or of *bread, wine*, or the like: no oblation of *Christ's body*, or *blood*, or of *Christ* absolutely, as we shall find afterwards. Hence it is, that some very learned men have thought that, according to the ancients, the *oblation* was considered always as previous to *consecration*, and that the elements were *offered* in order to be *consecrated*:* which indeed is true according to that sense of *oblation* which obtained for two centuries and a half: but a *new sense*, or *new application* of the word, or name, came in soon after, and so it will here be necessary to distinguish *times*.

"I shall now pass on to Cyprian, to shew how this matter stood upon the *change* of language introduced in his time. We shall find him plainly speaking of the *offering* Christ's *body* and *blood*.† This must be understood of an oblation subsequent to consecration, not in order to it: for Christ's body and blood, whether real or symbolical, are *holy*, and could want no sanctification or consecration. He further seems to speak of *offering* Christ Himself,‡ in this sacrament unto God, but under the symbols of *consecrated* bread and wine. That may be his meaning: and the meaning is good, when rightly apprehended; for there was nothing new in it but the *language*, or the manner of expression. What the elder Fathers would have called, and did call the *commemorating* of Christ, or the *commemorating* his *passion*, his

* "It is manifest that it is called an *oblation*, or *sacrifice*, in all liturgies, according to the style of the most ancient Church-writers, *not as consecrated*, but as *presented*, and *offered* (whether by the people, as the custom was, to him that ministered, or by him that ministered, to God) *to be consecrated*."—(Thorndike, Relig. Assembl.) *Consecrationi* autem *oblationem* præpositam olim fuisse, adeo perspicuum ex *veterum* dictis, *liturgiisque* antiquissimis, maxime Græcis, esse arbitramur, ut nihil clarius esse possit. Pfaff. Fragm. Iren. in præfat.

† Obtulit [Dominus] hoc idem quod Melchisedech obtulerat, id est panem et vinum, suum scilicet *corpus* et *sanguinem*. Cyprian. Ep. lxiii. p. 105. edit. Bened. Unde apparet *sanguinem* Christi non *offerri*, si desit vinum calici, &c. p. 107.

‡ Nam si Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos Dei Patris, et sacrificium Patri *seipsum primus obtulit*, et *hoc fieri* in sui commemorationem præcepit, utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui *id quod Christus fecit*, imitatur, et sic incipiat *offerre* secundum *quod ipsum Christum* videat *obtulisse*. *Ibid* p. 109. Quia passionis ejus mentionem in sacrificiis omnibus facimus (passio est enim Domini, sacrificium quod offerimus) nihil aliud quam *quod ille fecit*, facere debemus. p. 109.

body broken, or *blood* shed; that Cyprian calls the *offering* of Christ, or of his *passion*, &c., because, in a large sense, even *commemorating* is *offering*, as it is presenting the thing or the person so commemorated, in the way of prayer and thanksgiving, before God. I do not invent this account for the clearing a difficulty, but I take it from Cyprian himself, whose own words shew that the Eucharistical *commemoration* was all the while in his mind,* and that that was all he meant by the *oblation* which he there speaks of, using a new name for an old thing. I shall shew in due time, that the later Fathers who followed Cyprian's language in this particular, and who admitted this *third* oblation (as some have called it) as well as he, yet when they came to explain, interpreted it to mean no more than a solemn *commemoration*, such as I have mentioned.

"I must further observe, that though Cyprian sometimes advances this new kind of language, yet elsewhere he follows the more ancient way of speaking, and understands *oblation* as other Fathers before him had done. Thus, when he speaks of the sacrifice *offered* in the Eucharist by the *poor*,† he means it of the *lay oblation* which was previous to consecration; as also when he speaks of the clergy's *presenting* the *oblations* of the people,‡ he is to be understood of the *first* and *second* oblations, both of them previous to consecration. And when he observes, that an *oblation* cannot be *sanctified* where the Spirit is not given,§ he uses the word *oblation* for what was antecedent; and it amounts to the same as if he had said, that such an oblation could not be *consecrated*, could not be made the *body* and *blood* of Christ."

Thirdly: Yet there can be no doubt that the ancients applied the terms in question to the Eucharist, on other grounds than either of those considered,—viz., because it is a commemoration and representation of the true sacrifice on the cross; and nothing is more common than to give the name of the reality to its representation. Thus, we say constantly of busts, "this is Cæsar," and "that is Shakespear," without being in any danger of being misunderstood as to the actual presence of either of these per-

* Calix qui in *commemorationem* (alias *commemoratione*) ejus offertur, p. 104. Quotiescunque ergo calicem in *commemorationem* Domini et passionis ejus offerimus, id quod constat Dominum fecisse, faciamus, p. 109.

† Partem de sacrificio quod pauper *obtulerit*, sumis. Cypr. de Op. et Eleem. p. 242.

‡ Qui communicando cum lapsis, et offerendo *oblationes* eorum, &c. Ep. xxviii. p. 38.

§ Nec *oblatio* illic sanctificari possit, ubi Spiritus Sanctus non est. Ep. lxiv. p. 112.

sonages. In the same way St. Paul says to the Colossians, (ii., 12.) "Ye are buried with Him (Christ) in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him;" where it is evident that he means *in a figure*. And this is the explanation which St. Augustine himself gives of the Eucharist. "Christ," says he, "was but once offered, and yet in the sacrament He is daily immolated; neither does he lie who says Christ is immolated; for if sacraments had not the likeness of those things whereof they are sacraments, they would be no sacraments at all; but from this likeness they received the names of the things themselves."* "Thus," as he gives several instances, "wherein that which is the memorial of a thing, does, for its similitude to that thing of which it is a memorial, receive its name, when Easter approacheth, we say, to-morrow or next day is the passion of Christ; and on the Lord's day, we say, this day Christ arose, when Christ's passion was but once, and that several years ago, and that day is said to be Christ's resurrection, which yet it is not."† What we call, then, a sacrifice, is a memorial or a sign, and a representation of a sacrifice, as he says in another place.‡ "We offer the same sacrifice that Christ did; for the passion of Christ is the sacrifice which we offer,"§ in St. Cyprian's words; or rather, "we perform a remembrance of a sacrifice," as St. Chrysostom speaks,‖ and after him

* Nonne Christus semel oblatus est? et tamen in Sacramento quotidie populis immolatur; nec mentitur qui dicit Christum immolari: si enim sacramenta non haberent similitudinem earum rerum quarum sunt sacramenta, nullo modo essent sacramenta, sed ex similitudine sæpe nomina earum accipiunt. August. Ep. 120. ad Honorat. (Ad. Bonifacium. Episcop. vol. 2. p. 267. Par. 1679.)

† Illud quod alicujus memoriale est propter similitudinem, sæpe ejus rei cujus memoriale est, nomen accipiat, ut appropinquante Paschate, dicimus cras aut parendie est Passio Christi, cum semel tantum ante multos annos sit passus, et die dominica dicimus, hodie Christus resurrexit, propter similitudinem enim dies ille id esse dicitur, quod tamen non est.—Ibid.

‡ Quod appellamus sacrificium, signum est et repræsentatio sacrificii. August. de Civit. Dei, l. 10. c. 5. (vol. 7. p. 242.)

§ Passio enim Domini est sacrificium quod offerimus. Cypr. Ep. 3. (Epist. 63. p. 231. Venet. 1738.)

‖ Οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας. Chrysost. in Heb. 10. Hom. 17. [vol. 12. p. 169. Par. 1135.]

Theophylact, "we always offer Him, or rather, we make a remembrance of His offering;"* "do we not offer unbloody sacrifices? yes, we make a remembrance of His bloody death,"† so that "instead of a sacrifice, *i.e.*, a proper one, He hath commanded us perpetually to offer up a memorial," as Eusebius more strictly words it.‡

We can, therefore, understand Augustine when he says, "Christus immolatur,—*i.e.*, Christi immolatio repræsentatur, et fit memoria Passionis,"§—"Christ is immolated, that is, His immolation is represented, and a memorial of His passion is made," even if he had not given us such a satisfactory explanation himself; and he also says most clearly, on another occasion, "What we call a sacrifice is a sign and representation of a sacrifice," as above instanced.

But there is no need of multiplying quotations where there is practically no limit to them, and where every man's judgment will confirm the *reasonableness*, if not the *necessity*, of the principle contended for. Indeed, it is not alone the early Christian Fathers who thus speak, but some of those most in esteem in the Church of Rome at the present day. Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas, both of whom lived before the doctrine of transubstantiation was *fixed*, and the sacrifice of the mass taught as it now is, gave the same reasons for calling the Eucharist a sacrifice, as Protestants do now, and the Fathers did in the early ages of the Church. The former says, "Moreover, in a few words it may be told, that that which is offered and consecrated by the priest, is called a sacrifice and oblation, *because* it is the memory and representation of the true sacrifice, and of the holy immolation made on the altar of

* Τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀεὶ προσφέρομεν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν τῆς προσφορᾶς ἐκείνης ποιοῦμεν. Theophylact. in Heb. 10. [vol. 2. p. 719. Venet. 1754.]

† Οὐχὶ ἡμεῖς ἀεὶ θυσίας ἀναιμάκτους προσφέρομεν. Ναὶ ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμεθα τοῦ θανάτου. Ibid.

‡ Μνήμην ἡμῖν παρέδωκε ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν. Euseb. Demonstrat. l. 1. c. 10. [ut supra, p. 38.] See Payne's Sacrifice of the Mass.

§ De Consec. Dist. 2. [cap. 26. Corp. Jur. Can. vol. 1. p. 1929. Lugd. 1671.]

the cross."* And Aquinas is very full, and says, "Both because the celebration of this sacrament is a certain image of Christ's passion; and also because we are, by means of this sacrament, made partakers of the benefits of the Lord's passion, it is fitly called the immolation of Christ. Because, first, it is an image of Christ's passion, for, as St. Austin says to Simplicius, images used to be called by the names of those things of which they are images; as, when we look upon a painted table or wall, we say this is Cicero, and that is Sallust; but the celebration of this sacrament is a representative image of Christ's passion, which is the true immolation. Another way as to the effect of Christ's passion; it may be called a sacrifice, because, by this sacrament, we are made partakers of the fruits of the Lord's passion.†

Now, had the Church of Rome been satisfied to leave the matter where her own best writers have left it, and where they might have been met by the cordial response of warm hearts, and every expression might have been reciprocated by loving spirits, no man's judgment being at the same time outraged, there would have been no necessity for the wide breach in visible unity which the dogmatic heresies of Trent have made, we fear, permanent. We might all have agreed with the language of a divine who well understood this subject, and to whom I am indebted for many of the immediately foregoing quotations.

"Christ is in some sense offered up to God by every communicant in the sacrament, when he does mentally and internally

* Ad hoc breviter dici potest, illud quod offertur et consecratur a sacerdote, vocari sacrificium et oblationem, quia memoria est et repræsentatio veri sacrificii, et sanctæ immolationis factæ in ara crucis. Lombard. l. 4. Dist. 12. [p. 301. Colon. Agr. 1566.]

† Tum quia hujus sacramenti celebratio, imago quædam est passionis Christi, tum etiam quia per hoc sacramentum participes efficimur fructus, Dominicæ Passionis—— convenienter dicitur Christi immolatio. Primo quidem, quia sicut Augustinus ad Simplicium, solent imagines earum rerum nominibus appellari, quarum imagines sunt, sicut cum intuentes tabulam aut parietem pictum, dicimus, ille Cicero est, et ille Salustius; celebratio autem hujus sacramenti imago quædam est repræsentativa passionis Christi, quæ est vera ejus immolatio——alio modo quantum ad effectum passionis Christi, quia sc. per hoc sacramentum participes efficimur fructus Dominicæ passionis. Thom. Aquin. Sum. 3. Pars. qu. 23. [vol. 24. p. 450. col. 2. Venet. 1787.]

offer Him to God, and present, as it were, his bleeding Saviour to His Father, and desire him for His sake to be merciful to him, and forgive him his sins. This internal oblation of Christ and His passion is made by every faithful Christian in his particular private devotions, and especially at the more solemn and public ones of the blessed sacrament, when he has the sacred symbols of Christ's death before him, and does then plead the virtue of Christ's sacrifice before God; not of the sacrifice then before him, but of the past sacrifice of the cross. This is all done by the inward acts, the faith, the devotion of the mind, whereby, as St. Austin says, 'Christ is then slain to any one, when he believes Him slain;'* and when we believe in Christ from the very remains of this thought, Christ is daily immolated to us.'† As St. Jerome says, 'when we hear the word of our Lord, His flesh and blood is, as it were, poured into our ears;'‡ and so St. Ambrose calls 'the virgins' minds those altars on which Christ is daily offered for the redemption of the body.'"§—*Payne's Sacrifice of the Mass.*

What has been said, then, will sufficiently explain all such passages as assign to the ministers of the New Testament the offering of sacrifices; for it is not alone theirs, in the sense in which it is true of all Christians as "kings and priests to God," to offer their own prayers and praises, but they act ministerially in offering those of the Church; and still further they seem, not inappropriately, to be said to "offer the sacrifice of the Lord's body and blood," seeing it belongs to them peculiarly to celebrate the sacramental representation of Christ's sacrifice in the Eucharist. The significance of all such phrases, as when Ignatius says, "It is not lawful for the priest to offer without the bishop;" and when the Council of Nice decrees, "Deacons are forbidden to offer the

* Tum Christus cuique occiditur, cum credit occisum. Augus. Quæst. Evang. 1. 2.

† Cum credimus in Christum ex ipsis reliquiis cogitationis, Christus nobis quotidie immolatur. Idem in Psal. 73.

‡ Cum audimus sermonem Domini, caro Christi et sanguis ejus in auribus nostris funditur. Hieron. in Psal. 147. [vol. 7. Append. p. 385. Veron. 1737.]

§ Vestras mentes, confidentur altaria dixerim, in quibus quotide pro redemptione corporis Christus offertur. Ambros. de Virg. 1. 2. [vol. 2. p. 166. Par. 1690.]

body of Christ,"* it is easy to understand. Every mention of Christ's merits and work in prayer, is *truly* an offering to the Father of the sacrifice of His Son, whether by priest or people; and the representation of Christ's death in the breaking of bread and the outpouring of the wine, may be called all that the Fathers call them. It is only when these phrases are bound down to literal interpretation, and Christ's body and blood, which are offered as objectively sacrificed in heaven, are declared to be subjectively present on the altar and in the elements, that we not only "withhold our assent," but emphatically protest against a doctrine which, by destroying the efficacy of the sacrifice of the cross, destroys man's hope of mercy, and still further jeopardises his salvation, by demanding supreme worship for one of the Almighty's perishable creatures.

I have thus at some length examined the circumstances under which the Fathers call the sacrament of the Lord's Supper *a sacrifice*, and the various senses in which they apply the word to it. There are, doubtless, other points of view in which it is made to bear the same name; but there is not one passage in which the sense of the Church of Rome is borne out by the context. The patient and sensible Waterland waded leisurely through almost all the texts of the Fathers of the first three centuries, which bore in any degree upon the subject, and has given the result of his investigation in his work, entitled "A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down in Scripture and Antiquity." To his work, then, I beg to refer any one wishing more thoroughly to investigate this matter, and shall conclude this branch of my subject by giving his summary of the various senses in which the words sacrifice, offering, and oblation, are applied by the Fathers of the anti-Nicene period to the Eucharist:

"The service, therefore, of the Eucharist, on the foot of ancient Church language, is both a true and a proper sacrifice (as I shall shew presently), and the noblest that we are capable of offering, when considered as comprehending under it many true and evan-

* Can. 14.

gelical sacrifices: 1. The sacrifice of alms to the poor, and oblations to the Church; which, when religiously intended, and offered through Christ, is a Gospel sacrifice.* Not that the material offering is a sacrifice to God, for it goes entirely to the use of man; but the service is what God accepts. 2. The sacrifice of prayer, from a pure heart, is evangelical incense.† 3. The sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God the Father, through Christ Jesus our Lord, is another Gospel sacrifice.‡ 4. The sacrifice of a penitent and contrite heart, even under the Law, (and now much more under the Gospel, when explicitly offered through Christ,) was a sacrifice of the new covenant:§ for the new covenant commenced from the time of the fall, and obtained under the law, but couched under shadows and figures. 5. The sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, is another Gospel sacrifice.‖ 6. The offering up the mystical body of Christ—that is, His Church—is another Gospel sacrifice;¶ or rather, it is coincident with the former; excepting that there persons are considered in their single capacity, and here collectively in a body. I take the thought from St. Austin,** who grounds it chiefly on 1 Cor. x. 17, and the texts belonging to the former article. 7. The offering up of true converts, or sincere penitents, to God, by their pastors, who have laboured successfully in the blessed work, is another very acceptable Gospel sacrifice.†† 8. The sacrifice of faith and hope, and self-humiliation, in commemorating the grand sacrifice, and resting finally upon it, is another Gospel sacrifice,‡‡ and eminently proper to the Eucharist.

* Phil. iv. 18. Heb. xiii. 16. Compare Acts x. 4. Ecclus. xxxv. 2.

† Revel. v. 8. viii. 3, 4. Compare Psalm cxli. 2. Malachi i. 11. iii. 4, 5. Hos. xiv. 2. Acts x. 4. Eccl. xxxv. 2.

‡ Heb. xiii. 15. 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. Compare Psalm l. 14, 15. cxvi, 17. lxix. 31.

§ Psalm li. 17. iv. 5. Isa. i. 16. lvii. 15.

‖ Rom. xii. 1. vi. 13. Phil. ii. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 6.

¶ 1 Cor. x. 17.

** Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 243. Cap. xx. p. 256. Epist. lix. alias cxlix. p. 509. edit. Bened.

†† Rom. xv. 16. Phil. ii. 17. Compare Isa. lvi. 20. cum notis Vitring. p. 950.

‡‡ This is not said in any single text, but may be clearly collected from many compared.

" These, I think, are all so many true sacrifices, and may all meet together in the one great complicated sacrifice of the Eucharist. Into some one or more of these may be resolved (as I conceive) all that the ancients have ever taught of Christian sacrifices, or of the Eucharist under the name or notion of a true or proper sacrifice.

" Supposing this account to be just, from hence may easily be understood how far the Eucharist is a commemorative sacrifice, or otherwise. If that phrase means a spiritual service of ours, commemorating the sacrifice of the cross, then it is justly styled a sacrifice commemorative of a sacrifice, and in that sense a commemorative sacrifice: but if that phrase points only to the outward elements representing the sacrifice made by Christ, then it means a sacrifice commemorated, or a representation and commemoration of a sacrifice.*

" From hence, likewise, may we understand in what sense the officiating authorised ministers perform the office of proper, evangelical priests in this service. They do it three ways: 1. As commemorating in solemn form the same sacrifice here below, which Christ, our High Priest, commemorates above. 2. As handing up (if I may so speak) those prayers and those services of Christians to Christ our Lord, who, as High Priest, recommends the same in heaven to God the Father.† 3. As offering up to God all the faithful who are under their care and ministry, and who are sanctified by the Spirit.‡ In these three ways the Christian officers are priests, or liturgs, to very excellent purposes, far above the legal ones, in a sense worth the contending for, and worth the pursuing with the utmost zeal and assiduity."

* Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso ? Et tamen in sacramento non solem per omnes paschæ solennitates, sed omni die populis immolatur; nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus, eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent: ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo, secundum quandam modum, sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est; ita sacramentum fidei fides est.—Augustin. Epist. ad Bonifacium xcviii. alias xxiii. p. 267. ed Bened.

† Revel. viii., 5. Vid. Vitring. in loc. ‡ Rom. xv. 16.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ANCIENT LITURGIES.

I HAVE purposely avoided saying much hitherto on the subject of the ancient Liturgies, intending to devote a separate chapter to their consideration. There can be no doubt but that these documents are most important, and their contents must materially influence the controversy in which we are engaged. Extending, as they do, over nearly the whole area of ancient Christendom, and exhibiting a faithful picture of the Church engaged in its solemn Eucharistic service, it is impossible but that they must be felt to be exceedingly interesting in themselves, and most weighty as far as they afford any testimony upon the questions which are now agitated amongst us.

The earliest writer, who goes at any length into the rites and ceremonies observed in administering the Lord's Supper, is Justin Martyr. Justin was a Greek, and a native of Sichem, the ancient capital of Samaria. Having, at Ephesus, tried the round of the Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and Platonic philosophy, he became fully convinced of the insufficiency of them all for happiness, and tried Christianity as a last resource. Still, bearing the philosophic cloak of the heathen schools, he undertook to teach and to defend the truths of his new creed, and it is in the first of two apologies for his religion, addressed to the Roman emperor, Antoninus Pius, that we find a circumstantial account of the mode in which the Eucharist was administered. Being the most ancient, it is in all probability the most pure, and is, therefore, of great importance in our controversy. The following summary of this

first apology of Justin is given as follows, by a judicious living writer: — "Justin presented his first apology, on behalf of the Christian religion, to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, at Rome, about the year 140 or 148. In this treatise he shows, first, how unjust it was that Christians should be condemned without a lawful hearing and trial, and how undeserving of punishment they really were;—that their religion was adapted to make men good citizens, rather than to injure the state;—that their principles did not tend to atheism;—that the dangers and privations to which they exposed themselves evinced the sincerity of their belief;—and that they were not guilty of the immoralities which were sometimes laid to their charge. He then proceeds to adduce proofs of the truth of Christianity;—shewing that Jesus was the Messiah, from ancient prophecies, which he supposes to have been at the foundation of many fables by which the evil spirits (who had become acquainted with them) had imposed upon mankind. He asserts that Plato had derived his doctrine concerning the formation of the world from the Mosaic account of the creation. In the concluding portion of the work he gives a circumstantial (and to us very important) account of the habits and customs of Christians in his day, and especially of their mode of celebrating divine worship. Justin gives two descriptions of the Eucharistic service, immediately following each other, and nearly in the same words. Either the second of these accounts is a mere recapitulation of the former; or, which is more probable, the former relates to the Eucharist administered immediately after baptism, called the first communion, and the latter to the ordinary administration of the sacrament on the Lord's day, in connexion with the Agapæ. This supposition is supported by the allusion made to the distribution of the oblation among the absent, the sick, and the poor.*

"Justin does not record the precise words of consecration used in his time, neither does he mention any form which may have accompanied the distribution. But, on the former of these matters

* See Appendix G.

his brief account tends to throw some light. He speaks of a 'thanksgiving to the Father of the universe, through or in the name of His Son, and the Holy Ghost;' whence it appears that the consecration was made in the name of the sacred Trinity in Unity, and that mention was made of the third person, although the ἐπίκλησις τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου, the calling upon the Holy Spirit, may have been no special and distinct act or part of the solemnity. Here is mention, also, of a particular thanksgiving, whence the name εὐχαριστία."—*Riddle's Christian Antiquities.*

The next account of the ancient celebration is that contained in the apostolic constitutions, a document, doubtless, of great antiquity, but not the production of Clement of Rome, as it professes to be. Their date is not satisfactorily fixed, but they are supposed by most to have been written at different times, during the second and third centuries, and to have been compiled before the first general council of Nice, in 325. They are referred to by Eusebius and his great antagonist, Athanasius. The constitutions are also quoted by others in the third and fourth centuries. "On the whole," says the writer above quoted, "it appears probable, from internal evidence, that the Apostolical Constitutions were compiled during the reigns of the heathen emperors, towards the end of the third century, or at the beginning of the fourth; and that the compilation was the work of some one writer (probably a bishop) of the Eastern Church. The advancement of episcopal dignity and power appears to have been the chief design of the forgery. If we regard the Constitutions as a production of the third century (containing remnants of earlier compositions), the work possesses a certain kind of value. It contributes to give us an insight into the state of Christian faith, the condition of the clergy and inferior ecclesiastical officers, the worship and discipline of the Church, and other particulars, at the period to which the composition is referred. The growth of the episcopal power and influence, and the pains and artifices employed in order to derive it from the apostles, are here partially developed. Many of the regulations prescribed, and many of the moral and religious

remarks, are good and edifying; and the prayers especially breathe, for the most part, a spirit of simple and primitive Christianity."

In the eighth book of the Canons, we find the oldest record of the full form of prayers and ceremonies observed in the Eucharistic celebration. Though we do not know that it was ever adopted by any Church as its authoritative ritual, yet it is the model upon which all others are formed; and being the most simple, and exhibiting nearly all the features of the most primitive description of the Eucharistic service by Justin, it must be looked upon as of equal authority with, if not of greater than, any of those which were formed from it. In the Constitutions, it is called "the order of James, the brother of John, the son of Zebedee."* 'Tis true that Renaudot censures pretty freely this form, and declares it corrupt and less to be trusted than others of a subsequent date. I confess I do not see how this can be, and Renaudot has not at all helped us, by *specifying* anything. He deals out a general charge of corruption, and there leaves it. But wherein do these corruptions consist? It is not likely that the very earliest liturgy which we have would have *suppressed* anything, and it is chiefly in what we, Protestants, call corrupt additions, that there is any difference between this form and the other ancient liturgies. While, however, it does not sanction what we charge as novelties, it has the general support of the summary of Justin, written 150 years previous to its own probable compilation, and giving no countenance to the additions

* Instead of here giving, as I had intended, a comparison of the account afforded by Justin, with that of the service in the Canons, I have added both of these valuable documents in an appendix (see Appendix G), for the full satisfaction of the reader. It is better far to be able to see and read the original for one's self than to have ever so full an epitome provided. The comparison of these with our own service, used on the same occasion, will shew how near we come to the primitive model in celebrating the same service; while the absence of the corruptions which afterwards appeared in the derived offices, will shew us our safety in cleaving to a church which, in this matter, holds not only to the scriptural model, as far as that appears, but also has the oldest ecclesiastical sanction for its established ritual. The *truest* antiquity is ours—that of the *earliest* Fathers and the inspired apostles.

which are contained in others, it is yet fully supported, by all those which differ from it on other points, in what it contains. Thus the charge of corruption must be laid rather at other doors, and this liturgy taken as the standard by which the rest must be judged, whether approved or condemned.

This liturgy, which, though professing to be that of James, is generally called the Clementine, because found in the apostolic canons which are assigned to Clemens Romanus as their author, differs in some very important particulars from the liturgy of St. James the Less, the Lord's brother. I will give a brief sketch of that which has come to us under that designation, and which Mr. Wilberforce, following his co-religionists of the Romish Church, claims to be the standard of comparison. It is difficult to see how a *later* and *more diffuse* form can be the original; simplicity and priority being always considered two sure proofs of originality and truth. That it is corrupt, we are unfortunately compelled to acknowledge, which a comparison with Scripture and with Justin proves: that it is more corrupt than later ones, every canon of criticism and the dictates of common sense emphatically deny.

The liturgy of St. James, which Mr. Wilberforce, in opposition to Dr. Brett, Mr. Johnson, Bingham, and other English divines, calls the most important of early liturgies, is that which was originally used by the Church of Jerusalem, as is evident from the fact that there is a special petition inserted in one prayer for "Zion." "We offer also to Thee, O Lord, for Thy holy places, which Thou hast glorified with the divine presence of Thy Christ, and the appearance of Thy most Holy Spirit; but chiefly for glorious Zion, the mother of all churches." It was referred to, Mr. Wilberforce tells us, by several writers within the patriarchate of Antioch, "as St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, Ephrem Syrus, and St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *who gives a description of it in his Mystagogical Catechism, by which alone it might be sufficiently identified. It seems to have been imitated, also, by the writer of the Apostolical Constitutions*, who lived in that part of the

world about the Nicene age, and who borrowed what he called the Clementine liturgy from the usages of the Church." I have given above the reasons why I cannot but agree with almost all Protestant divines, in according the first place to the Clementine liturgy,—viz., its priority and simplicity. The primitive form of this liturgy is, in its leading features, identified by comparison with the liturgies now in use among the Syrian Christians, which must be assumed to have had the same original, and which agree with it in all its important outlines.

Before I proceed to make any comparison of this liturgy with the Clementine, I must beg leave to qualify, if not to deny, the deduction of Renaudot, drawn from a comparison of the liturgy of St. James with those now in use among the Syrian or Monophysite Christians. The deduction which Renaudot makes is this—that seeing the separation between the Monophysites and the orthodox took place in 451, on the decision of the general council of Chalcedon against the former, and the two have never been united since; therefore every article, wherein the liturgies agree, must have been one existing in their common liturgy before the schism. The same reasoning he also applies in the case of the liturgy of St. Mark, which he compares with one occasionally used, at festivals, by the Egyptian Monophysites.* But will

* Mr. Wilberforce gives the following account of St. Mark's Liturgy, which may be taken as generally correct:—"A similar mode of argument enabled Renaudot to determine what was the ancient liturgy of St. Mark, or that which was employed in the Church of Alexandria. A liturgy, purporting to be that of 'the holy apostle and evangelist Mark,' and proved to be of Egyptian origin, by the prayers which it contains for the rising of the Nile, has been printed from a manuscript (compare Renaudot, i. 40, 144, &c., and Palmer's Orig. i. 85,) of the tenth or eleventh century, discovered in a Greek convent in Calabria. Now, this liturgy is found to tally exactly with that which is at present used at festivals by the Egyptian Monophysites, and which Renaudot translates from the Coptic; and the correspondence between them is found to extend even to those slight questions of arrangement in which different families of liturgies differ from one another. The Coptic service, indeed, bears the name of St. Cyril, whom the Monophysites (though unjustly) were accustomed to claim as authorizing their opinions: but that it presents the form in which the Alexandrian service was formerly solemnized, is shown by its re-production in the Æthiopic Canon, (Renaudot i., 496. Neale's History of the Eastern Church, i., 324. Palmer i., 97,) and its nine derivative liturgies. So that here again we can tell with certainty what

this deduction, however plausible at first sight, and abstractedly considered, stand the test of experience? Let us look at the case of the Church of England, and of those who dissented from it two centuries ago. On what grounds did the schism take place? It is notorious that it was not at all upon the same as those on which it is maintained to-day. The surplice or gown, the peals of the organ, the adornment of churches, &c., are no longer considered antagonistic to devotion, and savouring of heresy; but these objections (which were in themselves as contemptible as their results were wicked) have not only been renounced by the successors of the men who held them, but the contrary principles and practices have been adopted and acted upon. Now, this case is one far less likely to happen, than that which Renaudot considers impossible. The agreement between the Monophysite and the orthodox is upon matters beside and beyond the grounds of the original separation; but in our case the agreement is now on the former subjects of disagreement. As the case stands here, it is as if the Monophysites had renounced their errors and joined the orthodox, which they have not done. What was to prevent the same influences, acting in the same manner and with the same results, upon *all* the Syrian Christians, in matters concerning which there was no controversy between them? I confess I can see none; while, on the contrary, I think it the most natural thing in life that Protestant and Papist, Jew and Christian, orthodox and heretic, should be similarly influenced, when living in the same community, by the flux of time and the change of circumstances, in most matters wherein there was no antagonism between them. I do not see why the controversy respecting our Lord's nature, between the Monophysite and the orthodox, should have prevented their both being led insensibly by the same road

was the liturgy which was used in Egypt before the year 451; for the several parties by whom the documents have been preserved, have been separated, not only by religious antipathy, but by difference of speech." I have shewn in the text, that the test applied is by no means a certain one, and that a comparison with the Clementine liturgy proves, that the existing is *not* the anti-Nicene form of this or of the other liturgies, but one much corrupted by subsequent interpolations.

to the adoption of doctrinal errors, or of doubtful practices. I think, therefore, that the deduction of Renaudot cannot be maintained, and that agreement in matters beyond their original cause of separation in the liturgies of the orthodox and the schismatics, does not at all prove that these articles existed in the common liturgy before the commencement of the schism. Therefore it cannot be assumed that we can discover the anti-Nicene form of the liturgies, but the existing copies must be received as evidence only of the form existing in the age wherein they were made.

Now, in endeavouring to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion as to the measure of, I will not say authority, but of weight, which ought to be allowed to the contents of the various liturgies, it will be necessary to consider first their age, and next their purity, tested by comparison with the Clementine. For, as the learned Dr. Hickes says generally, " The ancient liturgies, how different soever among themselves, agree in all these things with Justin Martyr's account of the Eucharist, and the Eucharistical office in the apostolical constitutions, which is the standard and test by which all the others are to be tried. And by comparing those with this, the innovations and additions in after times, be they good or bad, will appear. . . . Among the additions, some are good, and some bad. And any man, who is conversant in the history of the councils, may see how and when both the sorts were introduced into the liturgies of the Church. Of the first sort is the word ὁμοούσιος, in acknowledging the Son to be of the same substance with the Father, which likely was not brought into the liturgies before the first Council of Nice. The Constantinopolitan, commonly called the Nicene creed, which could not be introduced before the second general council of Constantinople; the benediction in the name of the holy, consubstantial, and adorable Trinity, which must have come in after one of those two councils; the epithets added to the Holy Spirit* in the prayer of oblation, in which they did not only call Him τὸν παράκλητον, το

* Liturg. S. Marci. S. Jacobi.

πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, but τὸν κύριον, τὸν ζωόποιον, the Lord, the Giver of Life, who spake in the law, the prophets, and apostles, and who worketh sanctifying grace in all αὐτεξουσίως, οὐ διακονικῶς, by His own power, not as a minister, ἐκπορεύμενος, ὁμοούσιος, σύνθρονος, proceeding from the Father, being consubstantial to the Father, and sitting upon the same throne with Him and His Son Jesus Christ;—this must have been added after the second general council of Constantinople, κατὰ τῶν πνευματομάχων. In the same liturgy is this invocation of Christ, of the same date, κύριος, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἀκατάληπτε θεοῦ λόγε, τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ὁμοούσιε, συναΐδιε, σύναναρχε,—O Lord our God, the incomprehensible word of God, of one substance with, and co-eternal to, the Father and the Holy Spirit, and without beginning, accept our hymn, &c. *So the expression Ἀτρέπτως ἐνανθρωπήσας, who was made man, not by conversion [of the Godhead into flesh,] must have been added after the fourth general council of Chalcedon against Dioscorus and Eutyches. So, wheresoever we find the blessed Virgin called ἅγια Θεοτόκος, we may presume it was an addition brought in after the third general council at Ephesus, against Nestorius, who, not believing Christ to be God, would only call her χριστοτόκος, the Mother of Christ; though, as the Fathers of that council shewed, she was called Θεοτόκος by the writers of the Church in the ages before And, with these additions, I may take notice of the alterations from the ancient form of oblation of the elements to God the Father, to the oblation of them to God the Son, as an acknowledgment of His Godhead in the proper offices (as I have observed before upon the Æthiopic Liturgy) for Christmas, Easter, and Ascension-day, which could not come, I think, into use till after the first Council of Nice.

" But then, after the second Council of Nice, were introduced additions of the latter sort, whereby the liturgies were most abominably corrupted by commemorations, salutations, gratula-

* Liturg. S. Jacobi.

tions of the Holy Virgin, and desiring to be heard through her intercessions, and the intercessions of other saints. Among these additions, I may also reckon their superstitious practices, as putting warm water to the sacramental wine, saying prayers at putting on every vestment in the robing of the priest, making the sign of the cross upon the Δῶρα, and * the late addition of σταυροθεστόκος, the mother of the crucified God, to θεοτόκος, the mother of God."†

We will now proceed to compare the two liturgies—the Clementine and that of St. James—with each other.

In the apostolical constitutions, there are given what may be called a few introductory particulars, all of which were observed more or less by the whole Church. These consisted in the deacon giving the solemn admonition, as soon as the common prayers were over, Πρόσχωμεν — "Let us give attention." Then the Bishop gives his salutation to all present, saying, "The peace of God be with you all;" to which the reply of the people was, "And with Thy Spirit." Next the deacon says, "Salute ye one another with a holy kiss." "Then the clergy salute the bishop, and laymen their fellow laymen, and the women the women; the children standing before the *bema*, that is, either the reading-desk or the altar, with a deacon attending them, to see that they keep good order; others of the deacons walking about the Church, and inspecting the men and women, that there be no tumult, nor making of signs to one another, nor whispering, nor sleeping; and others standing at the men's gate, and the sub-deacons at the women's gate, that the doors be not opened for any to go in or out in the time of oblation. After this, the subdeacon brings water to the priests to wash their hands, as a sign of the purity of those souls that are consecrated unto God."—*Bingham.*

After these preliminaries commences the proper sacramental service as it is given in Appendix G (p. lxxiv.,) and which may be summed up under the following heads:—1. The admonition to the non-communicants to withdraw, and to the communicants to

* In Liturg. ante consecratorum. Bibl. Patr. vol. ii. Parisiis. 1624.
† Hickes' Christian Priesthood, cap. 2.

approach with charity and purity. 2. The common preface, *sursum corda,* "Lift up your hearts," preparatory to (3) The great εὐχαριστία "thanksgiving," being a summary of God's great mercies to His Church, through all time. 4. The hymn *Trisagion,* or as it was usually called, "the seraphic hymn," "Holy, holy, holy," included in the thanksgiving. 5. A special thanksgiving for the mercies of redemption through Jesus Christ. 6. The "form of consecration," always composed of a repetition of the words of institution, and a prayer to God to sanctify the gifts by His Holy Spirit. 7. "A prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth," enumerating all classes, especially the bishops and clergy, kings and magistrates,* the departed saints, martyrs, confessors, and all others, as recorded in the diptychs; all orders of the living in that particular Church, with those sick, in slavery, and banishment; all travellers, persecutors, heretics, and unbelievers; catechumens, energumens, and penitents; for healthy and fruitful seasons; the absent, &c.; concluding with a *gloria patri,* and a responsive "Amen" from the people. 8. Upon which the bishop says, "The peace of God be with you all," to which the people rejoin, "And with Thy Spirit." (Here, in such liturgies as contain them, follow the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and sundry benedictions; but these are wanting in the Clementine.) 9. Then follows the deacon's "bidding prayer;" and, 10. A short prayer by the bishop for worthy partaking of the Holy Supper. 11. The exclamation ἁγία ἁγίοις—"Holy things for holy persons," and the "*Gloria Deo excelsis,*"—"Glory be to God on high," came next, and the service concluded with the distribution, accompanied with the words (12), "The body of Christ," "the blood of Christ, the cup of life."

Now, in comparing the rival liturgy, St. James's, with the Clementine, we find many additions,—"some good and some bad," as Dr. Hickes has said,—but yet additions. The Virgin,

* For proof that the very general practice of the ancients, in praying for the dead did not arise from their belief in the Romish purgatory, and for the various reasons why they did so pray, see Bingham, book 15, cap. iii. ss. 16, 17.

for instance, is called in the Eucharistical prayer *Θεοτόκος*, which was not used by the Church generally till after the condemnation of Nestorius, by the Council of Ephesus, in 431. So, again, with respect to the Holy Spirit being consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father and the Son, the epithets which were adopted by the Council of Constantinople, in 381, and which are given above in the extract from Hickes's "Christian Priesthood," are found in this liturgy. Thus the decisions of the Church, on the Nestorian and Macedonian heresies, give us the means of testing, in some degree, the date antecedent to which the liturgy of St. James had not taken its present form.

The interpolations preceding, although manifesting a comparatively recent alteration in the liturgy of St. James, do not at all mar its orthodoxy nor detract from its weight. But such is not the case with some others found in it. The following apostrophe to, and praises of, the Virgin Mary, are evident corruptions and wholly unjustifiable:—"Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb; for of thee was born the Saviour of our souls." Also the next words—"Most holy, immaculate, superlatively blessed, and glorious lady." And what the singers say immediately after: "It is meet that we should truly magnify thee, the ever-blessed and immaculate parent and mother of our God, who art of more honour than the cherubim, and incomparably more glorious than the seraphim; thee we extol, who broughtest forth the divine Word without knowledge of man, and art truly the parent of God. Thou, O truth of grace, art the joy of the whole creation, of angels and men, a temple of holiness, a spiritual paradise, and the glory of virginity; of whom the Deity was incarnate; and our God, whose being is from eternity, was made a child. For thy womb was his throne, the seat of him whom the heavens cannot contain: for thou, O full of grace, art the joy of the universe! glory be to thee." Now these are extravagant praises, too great, most of them, to be given to a mortal, and are not so full in any other liturgy. However there is nothing of

them in the Clementine liturgy, which I have showed to be the test and standard by which they are to be tried.

The next corruption I shall give an account of in the words of Dr. Brett :—

"Another addition to the liturgy is, that after the priest has said, 'Holy things are for holy persons,' and the people have made the proper answer to it, 'then the priest breaks the bread, and, taking one-half in his right hand, and the other in his left, he dips the right-hand piece into the cup, and says: "The union of the most holy body and precious blood of our Lord God and Saviour, Jesus Christ." Then he signs the left-hand piece, and after that the other half, and immediately begins to break and distribute part into each cup, saying, "The union is made, sanctified and completed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now and for ever." And when he signs the bread he says, "Behold the Lamb of God, the Son of the Father, that takes away the sins, and was sacrificed for the life and salvation of the world." And when he distributes a piece into each cup, he says, "This is a part of Christ's most holy body, full of the grace and truth of the Father and the Holy Ghost, to whom be honour and power for ever and ever." Then he begins to break it into pieces. This custom of dipping a piece of bread into the cup is an ancient addition, and seems to have been elder in the Eastern Church than the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, that is, than the fifth century, because we find it in both the Nestorian and Monophysite liturgies. Now Nestorius was condemned, and he and his adherents excluded the communion of the Catholic Church in the year 431. Therefore, after that time, we have reason to believe they would not receive any new customs from the Catholic Church."

I have shewn, above, that this reasoning of Dr. Brett's, which is really that of Renaudot, is by no means conclusive as to the point of time. Like causes may have produced like results in the case of the orthodox, the Nestorians, and the Monophysites. The subject of this corruption was beyond the grounds of their disagreement, and, therefore, one party was as likely to be influenced by the causes which led to its adoption as another. The fact, however, that St. Cyril, who must have used the liturgy of St. James, omits all notice of the Virgin in his fifth catechism, affords a strong presumption that these praises and prayers

were not in the liturgy in his day; and, indeed, the divines of Cologne, in their Antididagma, a book written against Bucer and Melancthon, declare their opinion that the service formerly ended with the Lord's Prayer, and that what followed was "an interpolation or excrescence." Another practice which, though not found in express words in this liturgy, as we now have it,—but which grew necessarily out of moistening the bread in the wine, which custom is mentioned,—could not have existed in Cyril's time,—viz., that of putting the consecrated elements together into a spoon, and so administering to the laity; for, as the mystagogical catechisms give specific, though puerile, instructions as to how the hands should be placed while receiving the bread and also the cup, it is manifest such an unscriptural and unnatural mode of administering had not been adopted in his day. Now Cyril was appointed to his bishoprick about A.D. 350; and how could a practice, of which he knew nothing in the middle of the fourth century, have been in the liturgy which he used, even before the Nicene Council in 325? It is clear, therefore, that all the reasoning which is said to warrant the conclusion, that a comparison of liturgies will give us their anti-Nicene form, is fallacious, as has been shewn before. This custom was introduced probably some centuries after the time of Cyril; for it was a growing superstition, that led more and more to these absurd and mistaken practices, which, however innocent at first, became at length the cause of great injury both to faith and practice. It is refreshing, after reading the liturgies, to look back to the simple statement of Justin as to the practice of the Church in his day, and still more to read the unaffected record of the evangelists and the apostle as to the institution and the celebration, while the Church was in the hands of inspired men. It is sad to think that mistaken piety lay at the root of many corruptions in the Church.

It would seem to be wholly unnecessary to go through any more of the liturgies to shew their interpolations, &c. It seemed advisable, however, to do it in the case of that which bears the name of St. James, as it is made by the Romish divines the standard by

which all others are to be judged.* The decided objection which lies against this has been already shewn, and I shall now proceed to consider the use which is made of the liturgies in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist."

* It will be seen, from the following table, in what points the ancient liturgies agree, both as to matter and arrangement. It is taken from No. 63 of the "Tracts for the Times." As given in the tract, it is not without the usual indication of the bias of the mind of the writer towards "the centre of unity"—Rome:

I. It appears from Mr. Palmer's valuable work, that all the ancient liturgies now existing, or which can be proved ever to have existed, resemble one another in the following points:—

1. All of them direct, that previous to communion, those who intend to communicate shall "exchange the kiss of peace."

2. In all of them, the more particularly solemn part of the service commences with words exactly answering to the English, "Lift up your hearts," &c., as far as "Holy Father, almighty everlasting God."

3. All contain the hymn, "Therefore with angels and archangels," &c., with very trifling varieties of expression.

4. Also, they all contain a prayer, answering in substance to ours, "for the whole state of Christ's Church militant."

5. And likewise another prayer, which has been excluded from the English ritual, "for the rest and peace of all those who have departed this life in God's faith and fear," concluding with a prayer for communion with them.

6. Also a commemoration of our Lord's words and actions in the institution of the Eucharist; which is the same, almost word for word, in every liturgy, but is not taken from any of the four Scripture accounts.

7. A sacrificial oblation of the Eucharistic bread and wine.

8. A prayer of consecration, that God will "make the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ."

9. Directions to the priest for breaking the consecrated bread.

10. The Lord's Prayer.

11. Communion.

II. These parts are always arranged in one of the four following orders:—

St. James's Liturgy.
Oriental.

10. The kiss of peace.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
2. Therefore with angels.
5. Commemoration of our Lord's words.
6. The oblation.
4. Consecration prayer.
3. Prayers for the Church on earth.
7. Prayers for the dead.
9. The Lord's Prayer.
8. Breaking of bread.
11. Communion.

St. Mark's Liturgy.
Egyptian and Ethiopian.

10. The kiss of peace.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
3. Prayers for the Church on earth.
7. Prayers for the dead.
2. Therefore with angels, &c.
5. Commemoration of our Lord's words.
6. The oblation.
4. Consecration prayer.
8. Breaking of bread.
9. The Lord's Prayer.
11. Communion.

Mr. Wilberforce having satisfied himself of the age—anti-Nicene—of the Greek and Roman liturgies generally, and of their number—sixty-two eastern and at least eight western—enquires:

"Now, what is the conclusion to which these various liturgies conduct? . . That which is found to be the essential characteristic of all ancient liturgies—the very purpose, which not only speaks in their individual expressions, but gives shape and consistency to their whole arrangements—is, that they represent a certain transaction, a certain course of events, of which the crisis and consummation is that which is *done* in respect to the sacred elements themselves, with a view of giving to them their character and importance.

"We have every variety, therefore, in the initiatory parts of the service; but as soon as we come to the repetition of the words of institution, we find the most striking sameness of expression. The multiplied introductions of the Spanish and Gallic forms fall back into the appointed canon or order, so soon as the solemn words recur, 'who in the same night in which He suffered' [Qui pridie quam pateretur, &c.] Throughout all churches founded by the apostles, the exact repetition of those words which our Lord had originally uttered, were supposed essential to the consecration of the Eucharist. In all liturgies, with the smallest possible exception, they are found to be identical. This proceeds upon the principle which is explained in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, that the real minister in the consecration of the Holy Eucharist is Christ Himself.* The victim is identical with the priest.

St. John's Liturgy.	St. Peter's Liturgy.
Gallican, Ephesian, and Mozarabic.	*Roman, Milanese, African.*
3. Prayers for the Church on earth.	1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
7. Prayers for the dead.	2. Therefore with angels, &c.
10. The kiss of peace.	3. Prayers for the Church on earth.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.	4. Consecration prayer.
2. Therefore with angels, &c.	5. Commemoration of our Lord's words.
5. Commemoration of our Lord's words.	6. The oblation.
6. The oblation.	7. Prayers for the dead.
4. Consecration prayer.	8. Breaking of bread.
8. Breaking of bread.	9. The Lord's Prayer.
9. The Lord's Prayer.	10. The kiss of peace.
11. Communion.	11. Communion.

English Order.

3. Prayers for the Church on earth.	3. Commemoration of our Lord's words.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.	11. Communion.
2. Therefore with angels, &c.	9. The Lord's Prayer.
4. Consecration.	6. Oblation.

* Considering the general character of Luther's doctrine, it might have been expected that he would have admitted the reality of consecration, and probably he

'Thou art the thing offered and the offerer.* Such is the doctrine which is written no less clearly in the whole ritual, than in the individual expressions of the ancient writers. For why this scrupulous care to repeat† the exact words of our Lord, unless some peculiar effect was dependent upon the action? It proceeds upon the notion, which St. Paul authorizes, that the Holy Eucharist is a perpetuation of our Lord's passion, wherein that great event, on which the salvation of mankind wholly depends, is continually pleaded before God. 'As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come.'"

It is sufficient simply to notice the absurdity of the Archdeacon's remark, that "as soon as we come to the repetition of the words of institution, we find the most striking sameness of expression;" as if we could have had a repetition of the words of institution without "sameness!" and the assertion that "throughout all Churches founded by the apostles, the exact repetition of these words were [was] supposed essential to the consecration of the Eucharist," shall be noticed hereafter. What I now want to know is, why so much trouble should have been taken to prove

would have done so, if to recognise the priestly commission had not been its necessary result. The high Lutheran party, who drew up the Formula Concordiæ in 1580, ordered the repetition of our Lord's words of consecration, "ut elementa panis et vini ad hunc sacrum usum . . . . sanctificentur seu benedicantur."—Art. 7, p. 749. The effect of the omission may be seen in the gradual dying out of high views respecting the Holy Eucharist among the Lutherans. But, that Luther's own feelings on this subject harmonized with the ancient system, was shewn when he was brought into collision with Zuinglius in the conference at Marburg. "He did not teach (he said) that *men*, by their word, could bring Christ's body into the bread. Verba non nostra, sed Christi sunt: Facite, &c. Per hoc verbum facit, ut manus sacerdotis sit manus Christi. Os non est meum, lingua non est mea, sed Christi, though I be knave or cheat."—Collin in Hospinian, part ii. p. 124, as cited by Ebrard, vol. ii. p. 322. Ebrard would understand the last words—"ich sey ein bub oder schalk," as though Luther meant, "otherwise I am a knave." But they have surely a similar force to the statement in our 26th Article. The consecration is effectual, because wrought by Christ, though the minister may be an unbeliever. Luther repeats the same statement (Hospinian, vol. ii. p. 127): "Wen die wort über das Brot gesprochen werden, so ist der leib da, wie böss der sey der sie spaicht."

* *σὺ γαρ εἶ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος.*—Goar, p. 72.

† Hence, in the English canon, as Renaudot observes, the words of institution are ordered to be repeated if the consecrated elements are found not to be sufficient for the communicants.—Dissert. vol. i. p. xiii.—I have given notes and all, lest I be accused of "garbling."

the pedigree of the several liturgies, and that afterwards no use should have been made of them? It is remarkable that the Archdeacon makes no quotations from them to prove anything; but with the general reflection above given, about one idea pervading them, "that they represented a certain transaction, of which the crisis and consummation is that which is *done* with respect to the sacred elements themselves, with a view of giving to them their character and importance," he bids adieu to them and betakes himself to quotations from the Fathers.

Now, as we know what the idea intended to be conveyed in these words is,—viz., that the thing "*done* with respect to the sacred elements" is to make them, without a figure, the *veritable* body and blood of Jesus Christ,—let us see if this is the view which the ancient liturgies authorize of their character and importance. The question, then, is this: What do the liturgies mean, when they say, "Make this bread the precious body of Thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ, changing them by the virtue of Thy Holy Spirit?" Is the petition here offered for a change of *substance*, or a change in *use* and *virtue*?

First, what says the liturgy of St. James? (for I will confine my attention chiefly to those which are acknowledged of most weight by our opponent). In that liturgy the following occurs:—"Send Thy Holy Spirit upon us, and these holy gifts lying here before Thee, to the end that He coming may sanctify them by His holy, good, and glorious presence; and make this bread to become the holy body of Thy Christ, and this chalice the precious blood of Thy Christ, to the end it may have this effect to all them which shall receive it; namely, purify their souls from all manner of sin, and make them abound in good works, and obtain everlasting life."* Can any one say that the course of events here have their "crisis and consummation in what is *done* in respect to the sacred elements?" The end in view appears to me to have been, not so much to give the elements a character and importance, as that the recipients of these might be partakers of spiritual blessings.

* Bibliot. Patr. Græco. Lat., tom. ii., and Brett's Liturgies.

So, also, the liturgy of St. Mark: "Send on us, and on these loaves and chalices, Thy Holy Spirit, that He may sanctify and consecrate them, even as God Almighty; and make the bread the body, and the cup the blood, of the New Testament of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, our sovereign King; to the end they may become, to all those who shall participate of them, a means of obtaining faith, sobriety, health, temperance, a regeneration of soul and body, the participation of felicity, eternal life, to the glory of Thy great name."* Now here, what can be plainer than that the thing sought in the prayer is, not that the *substance* of the bread and wine might be changed, but that they might become, by a heavenly virtue, a means of imparting faith, and holiness, and eternal glory, to those who partook thereof?

The liturgy of St. Chrysostom scarcely differs from these in expression, much less in idea. "Make this bread," it proceeds, "to become the precious body of Thy Christ, and that which is in the chalice the precious blood of Thy Christ, changing them by Thy Holy Spirit, to the end they may purify the souls of those that receive them; that is to say, be made a proper means to purify the soul, by the remission of its sins, and communication of the Holy Spirit,"† &c.

And even in the Roman Missal we find, "Which oblation do Thou, O Lord, we beseech Thee, vouchsafe to render in all respects blessed, approved, effectual, reasonable, and acceptable, *that it may be made unto us* the body and blood of Thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ." Now, on the idea of a change of substance, *necessarily*, on the pronunciation of the magical words, *hoc est corpus meum*, such a prayer is absurd. And, moreover, the petitions in all the liturgies, that the elements might become to the receivers the means of spiritual blessings, seem equally absurd on the idea of transubstantiation; for since, after consecration, the body of Christ *must* be in the elements, it was impossible but that it must be received both by the good and

* Bibliot. Patr. Græco. Lat. tom. ii., and Brett's Liturgies.
† Euchar. Græcorum Jacobi Goar and Bibl. Patr. Græcor. Lat. tom. ii.

the bad. To the former it could not but be a benefit; to the wicked it must be just as necessarily a source of evil. These prayers are all rational, on the idea of the elements being accompanied by gracious influences; but on the idea of transubstantiation, and the virtue of the *opus operatum*, they are as absurd as they are unnecessary.

With this idea of sanctification agrees, also, the various terms used of the Eucharist; as when the ancient Church denoted consecration by ἁγιάζειν, to sanctify; or when the liturgies call the Mysteries ἁγιάσματα, ἅγια δῶρα, ἁγιάσθεντα δῶρα, ἅγια μυστήρια, μυστήρια ζώποιϊα, ἅγιος ἄρτος, "the sanctifications," "the holy gifts," "the sanctified gifts," "the holy mysteries," "the life-giving mysteries," "the holy bread," which are to be found on almost every page.

Now, as a further proof that the crisis and consummation of what was *done* was not "in respect of the elements themselves," it is to be noted that several of the liturgies call the elements, *after consecration*, by the same names as they did before, just as our Lord called the consecrated wine "the fruit of the vine,"* and St. Paul, also, over and over again.† Thus Justin Martyr says, "The Eucharistical office being thus performed by the bishop (that is, the bishop having consecrated), and concluded with the acclamations of all the people, those whom we call deacons distribute, to every one present, to partake of this Eucharistical *bread* and *wine*." Where is the proof that Justin considered *the thing done*, with respect to the elements, the crisis and consummation of the whole Eucharistic service?

In the Clementine liturgy, after the repetition of the words of institution, we have the expression, "We offer to Thee, our King and our God, according to this institution, *this bread* and *this cup*." And, again, in the liturgy of St. Mark, *after* the words of institution have been pronounced, the prayer is offered, "Send down Thine Holy Ghost upon us, and upon *these loaves* and *these cups*, that the Lord may sanctify and thoroughly consecrate

* Matt. xxvi. 29. † See 1 Cor. xi. 26, 27, 28.

them, making them His body and blood." Which expressions are thoroughly antagonistic to the whole of Mr. Wilberforce's theory; and prove (1) that the repetition of the words of institution alone were not considered to consecrate; (2) that after these words have been repeated, the elements had not changed their substance; and (3) that the change sought was one of sanctification and virtue by the influences of the Holy Spirit.

The liturgy of St. Chrysostom, *after* the repetition as above, says, with reference to the elements, "We offer to Thee Thine own, out of Thine own gifts;" and "We beseech Thee to send down Thine Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts lying before Thee." And immediately afterwards, twice we have the expression, "holy bread," and a prayer from the priest, "make this *bread* the precious body of Thy Christ."

And lastly, in the liturgy of St. Basil, immediately after what Mr. Wilberforce and the Romanists call the consecration,—*i.e.*, the repetition of the words of institution,—the deacon and the priest each use the term *holy bread* and *holy cup*. And just afterwards, the priest prays, "Unto all us who partake of this *one bread* and *one cup* in the communion of one Holy Spirit," though he does not hesitate to add, "and suffer none of us to partake of the holy body and blood of Thy Christ to our judgment and condemnation;" evidently calling *that* the body and blood of Christ, which a moment before he had called *one bread* and *one cup*: the latter, what they really were; the former, what they were in a figure.

It is hard to conceive how any one, reading such passages in the ancient liturgies, could rise up with the persuasion that they were formed on the idea of a change of substance, and not of use. It would be a misnomer altogether, if nothing worse, to call that "bread and wine," which was the true "body, blood, soul, and divinity" of Christ Jesus; though the contrary is not true, as every one's reason must tell him; for, on the common principles of every-day life, as well explained by the Fathers in this case, it is neither improper nor inconvenient to call things by the names of

what they represent. It is no answer to this to say, that the same is done in such cases as when Jesus, though God, is called Man, for the cases are by no means parallel. It is alleged, that after the words of consecration, transubstantiation has taken place, and no bread is left, but simply its appearance under the form of the elements; to call it bread is, therefore, to call it what it is *not;* but such was not the case with Christ's humanity;—it was as real as His divinity. He was Man as truly as He was God, and, therefore, could be called Man with the strictest propriety. The phraseology of the ancient liturgies, subsequent to the repetition of the words of institution, is absolutely fatal to the whole theory of the Romish Church on the subject of the Eucharist.

The absence of all adoration of the "host," in every one of the ancient liturgies, is also fatal to the theory that "the consummation of the series of events is, in what is done with respect to the elements;" for it is impossible to conceive that, in so many liturgies, and they embracing every form of variety, if the host had been adored, not even the slightest indication of such a practice should appear. This has been well put by an old writer as follows: "From the oldest liturgies and the Eucharistic forms, it appears that there was no adoration to the sacrament till of late; for in none of them is there any such mention, either by the priest or the people, as in the Roman missal and ritual, nor any such forms of prayer to it, as in their breviary. Cassander* has collected together most of the old liturgies, and endeavours, as far as he can, to shew their agreement with that of the Roman Church; but neither in the old Greek, nor in the old Latin ones, is there any instance to be produced of the priest's or the people's adoring the sacrament, as soon as he had consecrated it; but this was perfectly added, and brought in anew into the Roman liturgy, after the doctrine of transubstantiation was established in that Church, which has altered not only their liturgy, but even their religion in good part, and made a new sort of worship, unknown,

* Cassandri Liturgic. [Oper. p. 10, &c. Par. 1616.]

not only in the first and best times of the Church, but for about a thousand years after Christ. Boileau finding this, though a negative argument, press very hard upon them (and sure it cannot but satisfy any reasonable man, that there is no direction in the ancient liturgies for adoring the sacrament; and it is very hard to require us to produce a rubric against it, when nobody thought of that which after-superstition brought in), he would fain, therefore, find something in an old liturgy that should look like that of their own; and no doubt but he might have easily met with abundant places for their worshipping and adoring God and Christ at that solemn office of the Christian worship, the blessed sacrament; and therefore out of the liturgy called St. Chrysostom's, which he owns to be two hundred years later than St. Chrysostom, he produces a place, wherein it is said,* that "the priest and the deacon worship in the place they are in, and likewise the people;" but do they worship the sacrament? Is that, or only God and Christ, the object of their worship there? Is there any such thing to determine this, as they have taken care there should be in their missal? where it is expressly said several times, they shall worship the sacrament;† but here in St. Chrysostom's liturgy, it is God who is to be worshipped, "God be merciful to me a sinner;"‡ but in the Roman, it is the "sacrament is prayed to,"§ and they would reckon and account it as true irreligion, not to worship and pray to that, as not to worship God and Christ. So in the liturgy that goes under the name of St. James, the worship is only before the holy table,‖ as it is in the Church of England; and I hope Boileau will not pretend that

* Boil. De Euch. Ador. l. 2. p. 74. ex. Chrysost. Liturg. Εἶτα προσκυνεῖ ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ διάκονος, ἐν ᾧ ἐστι τόπῳ, καὶ ὁ λαὸς, ὁμοίως πάντες μετ' εὐλαβείας προσκυνοῦσιν.

† Sacramentum Adorare, Rom. Missal. Cooperto calice Sacramentum adorare, et genuflexus Sacramentum adorare.

‡ Ὁ Θεὸς ἱλάσθητί μοι ἁμαρτωλῷ. Chrys. Liturg. [p. 70. Par. 1560.]

§ Stans oculis ad Sacarmentum intentis precari.

‖ Προσκυνοῦσιν ἐμπροσθεν τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης. Liturg. St. Jacobi. [These words, though occurring in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, are not to be found in the Museum copy of that of St. James, ed. Par. 1560.]

this is to the holy table itself. If whatever we worship before, is the very object of our worship, then the priest is so, as well as the table; but it is neither he, nor the table, nor the sacrament, but only Christ Himself, to whom this worship is, or ought to be, given at the celebration of the Eucharist; and, therefore, this adoration was as well before as after the consecration of the sacramental elements, and so could not be supposed to be given to them."

But in this matter, the Archdeacon seems to think that he has made a strong point, and triumphs over the foreign Protestants in remarks upon an extract from the *Kirchen-Ordnung* of the Palatinate. The words quoted are as follows:—

"In order that we now, beloved in the Lord, may be fed by Christ with the true bread from heaven, let us not fix our hearts on the outward bread and wine, but raise up our hearts and faith above themselves to the heaven where Christ Jesus is an intercessor at the right hand of His heavenly Father; there let us exhibit for ourselves the articles of our Christian faith, and not doubt that as truly as we receive the holy bread and drink in His remembrance, He will feed our souls through the working of the Holy Ghost with His body, and make them drink of His blood."*

Upon which the Archdeacon remarks: "Here, then, we see the exact contrast between the ancient and modern services. The first suppose Christ to descend through the agency of His Spirit upon earth: the last suppose men to ascend through the action of their spirits into heaven."

Now, it is not at all to be feared that any one, perusing the ancient liturgies, would imagine that the prayers *after* consecration were addressed to a being corporeally present, any more than those preceding consecration. They are many of them addressed to God and Christ *in heaven*. As an instance, take that near the end of the service, which is found not only in St. Chrysostom's, but in St. Basil's, and other ancient liturgies. "Draw near, O Lord Jesus Christ our God, from the habitation of Thy dwelling, and the throne of glory in Thy kingdom, and come and sanctify

* Sammlung Kirchen-Ordnungen. vol. ii., p. 930.

us, O Thou, who sittest on high at the right hand of the Father, and at the same time art invisibly present with us here below: and vouchsafe to impart to us, by Thy mighty hand, Thine immaculate body, and most precious blood; and by us to all the people."

But what is St. Augustine's opinion of this triumph of Mr. Wilberforce? It is well known that the liturgies contain the words, Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας, *Sursum Corda*, "Lift up your hearts." The meaning of which we are told by St. Austin:* "What, therefore, is said in the sacraments of the faithful, that we should lift up our hearts to the Lord, it is a gift of the Lord." And he explains it, "That by the divine aid the soul is helped to ascend, and set its affections upon things above, where Christ is sitting at God's right hand, and not upon things on the earth." St. Jerome also, when speaking of the same Eucharistic feast, says, "Let us, with our Lord, ascend the great upper room prepared and made clean, and receive from Him *above* the cup of the New Testament, and there celebrating the Passover with Him, be inebriated by Him with the wine of sobriety."† What can be clearer than that we are to exalt our minds to heaven, where Christ is, there to celebrate the spiritual mysteries?

Chrysostom also, in his usual flowery and poetic style, says, on the same subject: "From thence we become eagles, and so fly to heaven itself; for where the carcase is, thither will the eagles come.‡ He calls his body the carcase, because of His death;

* De Bono Persev. l. 2. c. 13. Quod ergo in Sacramentis fidelium dicitur, ut sursum corda habeamus ad Dominum, munus est Domini—ut ascendat et quæ sursum sunt sapiat, ubi Christus est in dextra Dei sedens, non quæ super terram, &c.

† Ad Hedibiam, qu. 2. Ascendamus cum Domino cœnaculum magnum stratum et mundatum, et accipiamus ab eo sursum calicem N. Testamenti, ibique cum eo Pascha celebrantes inebrientur ab eo vino sobrietatis. [Epist. 120. vol. i. p. 818. Veron. 1735.]

‡ Πτῶμα καλῶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὸν θάνατον. Ἀετοὺς δὲ καλεῖ, δεικνὺς ὅτι καὶ ὑψηλὸν εἶναι δεῖ τὸν προσίοντα τῷ σώματι τούτῳ, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς τὴν γῆν κοινὸν ἔχειν, μηδὲ κάτω σύρεσθαι καὶ ἕρπειν, ἀλλ' ἄνω πέτεσθαι διηνεκῶς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιωσύνης ἐνορᾶν, καὶ ὀξυδερκὲς τὸ ὄμμα τῆς διανοίας ἔχειν· ἀετῶν γὰρ, οὐ κολοιῶν αὕτη ἡ πράπεζα. Vol. x., p. 233. Par. 1837.

and He calls them eagles, shewing that he who comes to this body ought to be sublime, and have nothing common with earth, nor be drawn downward and creep, but continually fly upward, and look to the Sun of Righteousness, and to have the eye of his mind quick-sighted; for this is a table for eagles, not for jackdaws."

Gregory Nazianzen asks, when speaking of persecutors as being able to drive him from earthly temples, "Will they drive me from the altars? I know another altar, whose types the things now seen are, upon which no axe has been lift up, no iron tool or other instrument has been heard; but is wholly a work of the mind, and an ascent by contemplation. Before this will I present myself; on this will I offer acceptable things; sacrifice, oblation, and holocausts, so much more excellent than the things now offered, as truth excels a shadow."*

Could any one imagine Gregory speaking thus, if he had any idea that the "sacrifice of the altar" was that of the *true* body of Jesus Christ, as much so as that of the cross—nay, that it was the very same? Whatever he might say in disparagement of his own devotions on the one occasion, compared with those of the other, he dared not thus to speak of that other had he deemed it the *awful, august, mysterious, efficacious,* &c. sacrifice of Christ.

Œcumenius, a Greek author, who abbreviated the works of Chrysostom in the ninth or tenth century, writes thus plainly—perhaps all the more plainly, because of the developments of error—"Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, seeing there remains nothing visible, neither the temple, that is heaven, nor the High Priest, that is Christ, nor the sacrifice, that is His body; it remains that we have need of faith."†

* Orat. 28. contr. Maxim. Οὗ τύποι τὰ νῦν ὁρώμενα. Ὅλον τοῦ νοῦ τὸ ἔργον, καὶ διὰ θεωρίας ἡ ἀνάβασις.—Κρείττονα τῶν νῦν προσαγομένων, ὅσῳ κρεῖττον σκιᾶς ἀλήθεια. [Vol. i., p. 484. Par. 1630.]

† In Heb. x., v. 22. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ λοιπὸν οὐκ ἔστιν ὁρατὸν οὐδέν, οὔτε ὁ ναὸς, τουτέστιν ὁ οὐρανὸς, οὔτε ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, τουτέστιν ὁ Χριστὸς, οὔτε ἡ θυσία, τουτέστι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, χρεία λοιπὸν πίστεως. [Vol. ii. p. 397. Lut Par. 1631.]

The Popish assumption, which is at variance with, and in direct contradiction to, the concurrent voice of antiquity,—viz., that the words of consecration in the Eucharistic service are, "This is my body," is fully adopted in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." That those words, which are simply *declaratory*, should ever have been taken as words of *blessing*, is strange enough. The inspired account of the institution, certainly leaves no doubt that the consecration by prayer had taken place *before* these words were pronounced; and, therefore, they cannot be assumed to do what had been done before. There is no ancient liturgy but negatives such an idea, by a special invocation for the Holy Spirit "to sanctify the gift" *after* the repetition of the words of institution, while there are some which further negative it most emphatically by not giving the words of institution at all.*

These are with Mr. Wilberforce, of course, *corrupted;* and notwithstanding that the whole of the Greek liturgies and their derivatives have the invocation of the Holy Spirit as a most prominent feature, not only subsequent to the repetition of the words, "This is my body," but for the *expressed purpose* of

* Mr. Wilberforce admits this, but, wonderful to relate, makes it corroborate his argument! Who could convince a man, when omission or insertion equally answers his purpose? This is an improvement on Goldsmith's schoolmaster, of whom it is predicated that, "although vanquished he could argue still." Mr. Wilberforce is never vanquished. His words are as follows:—

"It was stated that all ancient liturgies, with the very smallest exception, repeat the precise words of consecration, supposing that their exact repetition is essential, because they are effective and not merely declaratory. The only exception would seem to be found in some copies of certain Syriac Monophysite liturgies. It can hardly be supposed, as Renaudot conceives, that the omission which is observable in these liturgies has arisen from negligence, or because those well-known words, which were always employed, were repeated from memory, inasmuch as the institution appears to be really narrated, but in an imperfect and abbreviated form. Of the three liturgies to which this remark applies, that of Xystus, the 2nd of St. Peter, and that of Barsalibi; the two first are given by Renaudot, from other authorities, in a more perfect form; that of Barsalabi, he seems to have found incurable. But, however singular and censurable may be these deviations from the usual rule, *they rest upon a principle which tends to corroborate the present argument.* For it can scarcely be doubted, that the peculiarity which distinguishes these few (and comparatively modern) Monophysite liturgies, results from the great stress which they lay on another part of the liturgic office, the invocation of the Holy Ghost." Does this omission of the words of institution corroborate the idea that they are effectual?

making the bread and the wine (thus called) the body and blood of Christ, yet this, he says, by no means interferes with the Popish theory, that the consecration and transubstantiation *have already taken place.* In fact, we are told that it is not absurd to pray for that to be done by the agency of the Holy Spirit, which had been previously done by the *direct* interposition of Christ.* This absurdity is attempted to be established through some forty pages of Mr. Wilberforce's volume; and the attempt is made by breaking down the distinction between the work of the Son and the Holy Spirit, wherein, if I mistake not, that gentleman falls into some phases of Sabellianism, while accusing others of it.† He says that an opinion, which would imply that the action of the Second and Third Persons was *successive,* would be entitled to that appellation. But surely the contrary is more true. That which tends to make them identical and synchronize is Sabellian. It is absurd to say, that because the Eternal is not affected by time and its lapse, that, therefore, *we* are to act and speak of and to the Deity as though there were none with us. Indeed, no one point is clearer than that all the ancient churches believed the consecration of the elements to be effected by the prayers which were offered, and by the descent of the Holy Ghost. One view of this is very well and briefly put by Bishop Morton, in his charge of novelty against the Church of Rome, as follows:

"The first transgression of the (now) Church of Rome, in contradicting Christ his canon, is collected out of these words, 'And he blessed it;' which concern the consecration of this sacrament.

* "This (that is, the consecrating efficiency of *hoc est corpus meum*) proceeds upon the principle which is explained in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, that the real minister in the consecration of the Holy Eucharist is Christ Himself. The victim is identical with the priest. 'Thou art the thing offered and the offerer.'"—Doct. H. Euch. p. 52.

† Walsh *Hist der Ketzer* gives the following definition of Sabellianism:—"The ancients, one and all, say that the Sabellian system marred the true doctrine concerning God, and concerning all the three persons. It was one of two directly opposite errors, of which Arianism was the other; and the true doctrine occupied the middle ground between them. Indeed Arius, by pushing his opposition to Sabellius too far, was led into his error. It hence follows that Sabellius, who did not deny the existence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, made too little distinction between them, while Arius made the distinction too wide." Does not Mr. Wilberforce do the former?

First, of the bread, the text saith, 'He blessed it;' next, of the cup, it is said, 'When He had given thanks;' which words, in your own judgments, are all one as if it should be said, 'He blessed it with giving of thanks.' By the which word, blessing, he doth imply a consecration of this sacrament. The canon of the Romish mass attributeth the property and power of consecration of this sacrament only unto the repetition of these words of Christ, 'This is my body,' and 'this is my blood,' &c., and that from the judgment, as some say, of your Council of Florence and Trent. Moreover, you also alleged, for this purpose, your public catechism and Roman missal, both which were authorised by the Council of Trent, and command of Pius Quintus, then pope. Whereupon it is that you use and attribute such efficacy to the very words, pronounced with a priestly intention, as to change all the bread in a baker's shop, and wine in the vintner's cellar, into the body and blood of Christ. And your *Summa Angelica* speaketh more largely concerning the bread, namely, if it were done conformably to the intention of the Church, and two of your Jesuits, concerning both kinds. But Christophorus, your own Archbishop of Cæsarea, in his book dedicated to Pope Sixtus Quintus, and written professedly upon this subject, cometh in, compassed about with a cloud of witnesses and reasons, to prove that the consecration, used by our Saviour, was performed by that his blessing by prayer, which preceded the pronouncing of those words, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, 'This is my body,' &c. To this purpose he is bold to aver, that Thomas Aquinas, and all Catholics before Cajetane, have confessed that Christ did consecrate in that his *benedixit;* that is, 'he blessed it.' And that St. James, and Dionyse the Areopagite did not consecrate only in the other words, but by prayer. Then he assureth us that the Greek Churches maintained, that consecration consisteth in benediction by prayer, and not in the only repetition of the words aforesaid. After this he produceth your subtlest schoolman, Scotus, accompanied with divers others, who derided those that attributed such supernatural virtue to the other form of words. You shall further

find alleged the testimonies of Pope Gregory, Hierome, Ambrose, Bernard, and (to ascend higher) the liturgies of Clement, Basil, Chrysostom, and of the Roman Church itself, in gainsaying of the consecration by the only words of institution, as you pretend. And in the end he draweth in two popes, one contradicting the other in this point; and hath no other means to stint their jarr, but (whereas the authority of both is equal) to think it just to yield rather to the better learned of them both. Whosoever requireth more, may be satisfied by reading of the book itself. And yet we would be loth to pretermit the (confessed) testimony of your Jesuit Gordon, out of St. Augustine, attesting that in this sacrament, the fruit of the earth is consecrated by mystical prayer. It will not suffice to say, that you also use prayer in the Romish liturgy: for the question is not merely of praying, but wherein the form of benediction and consecration more properly doth consist. Now, none can say that he consecrated by that prayer, which he believeth is not ordained for consecration.

"We may further take hold, by the way, of the testification of Mr. Brerely, a Romish priest, who out of Basil and Chrysostom, (calling one part *Calix benedictione sacratus*) alloweth benediction to have been the consecration thereof. All this army of witnesses were no better than meteors, or imaginary figures of battailles in the air, if that answer of Bellarmine may go for warrant; to wit, that 'the only pronunciation of these words, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, imply in them,' as he saith, 'an invocation or prayer.' Which words, as any man may perceive, Christ spake not supplicatory unto God, but declaratively unto His apostles, accordingly as the text speaketh, 'He said unto them,' as is also well observed by the aforesaid Archbishop of Cæsarea, out of St. Hierome. But none of you, we presume, will dare to say that Christ did invocate His disciples. This might Bellarmine have learned from antiquity, if he had not rather affected to have been a doctor over all others, than a scholar to the primitive Fathers; who teach that Christ revealed not unto any His words of invocation by prayer wherewith He consecrated; which they

would not have said, if they had judged these words, 'This is My body,' to imply in them an invocation. These words, therefore, are of declaration, and not of invocation. Which now Romish doctrine of consecrating by reciting these words, 'This is My body,' &c., your divines of Colen have judged to be a fierce madness, as being repugnant both to the Eastern and Western Churches. But we have heard divers western authors speak, give leave to (Nicholas Cabasilas, Archbishop of Thessalonica) an eastern archbishop, to deliver his mind. 'No apostle or doctor is known to affirm,' saith he, 'those sole words of Christ to have been sufficient for consecration.' So he, three hundred years since, satisfying also the testimony of St. Chrysostom, objected to the contrary. This archbishop, you grant, was famous in his time, living about the year 1300, to whom, as you know, the Bishop of Ephesus and the patriarch of Constantinople did accord, saying, that 'this sacrament is not made as soon as these words are uttered, but afterwards by certain prayers of the Church.' And why these Greek Fathers should not rather resolve us of the ancient Greek tenor of consecration, than any of your late Italian or Latin doctors, who will make question? As for your other Greek patriarch Bessarion, who was made cardinal by your Church, on purpose that he might make some opposition to his fellows, we make no other account of him than of an hireling. None of the great multitude of Fathers, who have required the use of prayer besides these words, 'This is My body,' did thereby testify that they held these words to be words of invocation. As miserable and more intolerable is the answer of others, who said that the evangelists have not observed the right order of Christ, His actions: as if He had first said, 'This is My body,' by way of consecration, and after commanded them to 'take and eat.' Which answer your own Jesuit hath branded with the note of *falsity:* yea, so false it is, that (as is further avouched) all ancient liturgies, as well Greek as Latin, constantly held, that in the order of the tenor of Christ His institution, it was first said, 'Take ye,' before that He said, 'This is my body.' Lastly, your

other lurking-hole is as shameful as the former, where, when the judgment of antiquity is objected against you, requiring that consecration be done directly by prayer unto God, you answer, that some Fathers did use such speeches in their sermons to the people, but in their secret instruction of priests did teach otherwise. Which answer (besides the falsity hereof) we take to be no better than a reproach against antiquity, and all one as to say, that those venerable witnesses of truth would profess one thing in the cellar, and proclaim the contrary on the house-top. It were to be wished, that when you frame your answers to direct other men's consciences, you would first satisfy your own, especially being occupied in souls' businesses. We conclude, seeing that form (as all learning teacheth) giveth being unto all things; therefore your Church, albeit she use prayer, yet erring in her judgment concerning the perfect manner and form of consecration of this sacrament, how shall she be credited in the materials? wherein she will be found, as well as in this, to have transgressed the same injunction of Christ, 'Do this.' Nevertheless, this our conclusion is not so to be interpreted, as (hearken to Mr. Brerely) to exclude out of the words of this celebration the repetition and pronunciation of these words, 'This is my body,' and, 'This is my blood of the New Testament.' Far be this from us; because we hold them to be essentially belonging to the narration of the institution of Christ, and are used in the liturgy of our Church: for although they be not words of blessing and consecration (because not of petition, but of repetition), yet are they words of direction; and, withal, significations and testifications of the mystical effects thereof. For a further manifestation, hearken you unto that which is written: 'Every creature of God is good, if it be sanctified with the word of God and with prayer.'* Wherein we find a double acceptation of sanctification; the one of ordination, by the word of God; the other of benediction, namely, by prayer. For example, the eating of swine's flesh is

* 1 Tim. iv. 4

sanctified to the use of a Christian, first by ordination, because the word of God, in the New Testament, hath taught us the lawful use of swine's flesh; and secondly, by benediction, by prayer, or giving of thanks; in which respect it is that the apostle calleth one part 'the cup of blessing.'* Both of these are to be found in our sacramental food, wherein we have the sanctification thereof, both by the word of Christ, in the tenor of His first institution, 'He took bread,' &c.; adding, 'Do this;' as also by public blessing in prayer, which is more properly called consecration. And although, in our domestical feasts, the second course is blessed in the grace, which was said upon the first service, so the second supply of bread and wine (if it shall inordinately so happen) may not altogether be denied to be consecrated by the blessing pronounced on the first; (even as the sanctifying of the sheaf of corn was the hallowing of the whole field); notwithstanding our Church has cautiously ordained, that the words of institution, 'He took bread,' &c., be applied to every oblation of new bread and wine, for accommodation's sake, as they are referred in our liturgy, wherein they are necessarily joined together with the words of prayer and benediction. Therefore, where you shall find in the Fathers the words of Christ's institution, called consecration (as it is in Chrysostom and Ambrose†), it must be understood as joined with prayer, as the benediction itself, which has been already copiously confessed; as well as it has furthermore

* 1 Cor. x. 16.

† "To this mighty cloud of witnesses, the Romanists have nothing material to oppose, but a few mistaken passages of the ancients, which the reader may find related, with proper answers, in that excellent book of Mr. Aubertine upon the Eucharist. I shall only take notice of one, which carries the fairest pretence, out of Chrysostom, who, in one of his homilies [Hom. 30. de Proditione Judæ, t. 5. p. 463], speaks of the consecration after this manner:—'It is not man that makes the elements become the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself that was crucified for us. The priest stands fulfilling his office, and speaking those words; but the power and grace is of God. Christ said, 'This is my body;' this word consecrates the elements. And as that word which said, 'Increase and multiply, and replenish the earth,' was spoken but once, yet at all times is effectual in deed to strengthen our nature to beget children: so this word once spoken, from that time to this day, and until His coming again, perfects and consummates the sacrifice on every table throughout the churches.' The meaning of which is not, as the Romanists mistake, that the pronouncing of these

been acknowledged by your Jesuit Cressolius, that 'sometimes the whole sacred action was called consecration, insomuch that the deacon, who doth not meddle with the words of consecration, is notwithstanding called a consecrator by St. Ambrose.'"—*Bishop Morton's "Institution of Sacrament,"* [*p.* 9. *s.* 3, *Lond.* 1635.]

To this charge of Bishop Morton against the Romish Church, in the matter of consecration, I will add Bingham's excellent summary of ancient authorities for that view of consecration which is advocated by Protestants against the Church of Rome. The importance of the subject will excuse, if excuse be necessary, my giving so much upon it. In overthrowing the allegations of the Romish Church as to the transubstantiating power of the words, "This is my body," we overturn the whole of the theory built thereupon. According to the acknowledgments of Popish advocates, it is the pronunciation of these words which works the change, or it is not wrought at all: if, then, we shew that the voice of Catholic antiquity is against them in this, it necessarily follows that transubstantiation, with all its consequences, must fall to the ground. The summary of Bingham, after quoting,

words by the priest is the thing that makes the sacrifice; but that Christ, by first speaking those words, gave power unto men to make His symbolical body; as by once speaking those words, 'Increase and multiply,' He gave them power to procreate children. Christ's words are the original cause of the consecration; but still prayer, and not the bare repetition of His words, is the instrumental cause and means of the sanctification. As Chrysostom himself says plainly, in another place, [Ibid. Hom. 32. in cœmeterii appellationem, t. 5. p. 487.] where he attributes the consecration of the elements to the invocation of the Spirit, and the Spirit's descent pursuant to such invocation. What meanest thou, O man? says he. When the priest stands by the holy table, lifting up his hands to heaven, and invocating the Holy Spirit to come down and touch the elements, there should then be great tranquillity and silence. When the Spirit grants His grace, when He comes down, when He touches the elements, when thou seest the Lamb slain and offered, dost thou then raise a tumult and commotion, and give way to strife and railing? In which words, it is plain, Chrysostom attributes the consecration to the power of Christ and the Holy Spirit, as the principal and efficient cause; to prayer and supplication, as the instrumental cause, operating by way of condition and means, to sanctify the elements according to Christ's command, by a solemn benediction, and to the words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood,' as spoken by Christ in the first institution, implying a declaration of what was then done, and what should be done by His power and concurrence to the end of the world."—Bingham's Ant. bk. xv. c. 3. s. xi.

the prayer of invocation from the Clementine liturgy (which see Appendix G, pp. lxxix. lxxx.), is given as follows:*

"Justin Martyr† makes the consecration to consist in thanksgiving and prayers, which, being ended, all the people answer, Amen. Irenæus says more expressly,‡ that it is done by invocation of God: for the bread, which is taken from the earth, has the invocation of God upon it, and then it is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist. Origen says,§ it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer. Cyril, of Jerusalem, tells his catechumens, that before the invocation of the Holy Trinity,‖ the bread and wine of the Eucharist is common bread and wine; but after

* I know that a charge against the Church of England is frequently made, because she has omitted the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit, after the repetition of the words of institution in her service. It would seem, however, that she deems the whole of the antecedent prayers, in several of which there are petitions for the Spirit, as standing in the stead of any particular one, as is remarked above by Bishop Morton [see page 184 supra], and which appears to have been the opinion of several of the primitive Fathers [see page 188 infra.] This is, perhaps, more apparent when we consider that, in the first reformed prayer book, in King Edward's reign (A.D. 1549), the consecration prayer, as it is called, stood at the beginning of the service immediately after "the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth," which itself also followed the offertory sentences. In the new service book of 1552 the present order was in all essential points adopted, and continued in Elizabeth's of 1559. It is, perhaps, to be regretted that the Church of England should, in this respect, have deviated from the universal practice of antiquity, though my own impression is that the omission was designed, and *that*, the more emphatically to mark the reprobation by the Church of England of the idea that any substantial or essential change was wrought in the elements by any instrumentality. It is true that the rubric which now exists in our prayer books, respecting the consecration of more bread and wine, if the first consecrated be not sufficient, recognises the Popish idea that the repetition of the words of institution consecrate. This rubric, which was first inserted in 1662, is a great misfortune, as it not only itself sanctions the Popish error directly, but, taken in connection with the omission of the prayer of invocation for the Spirit, seems to exclude the necessity of anything else. In any future revision of the service, there can be no doubt, I think, that this rubric ought to be expunged, and a prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost inserted. This would make the Church of England less Romish, but more Catholic.

† Justin. Apol. 2. p. 97.

‡ Iren. lib. 4. cap. 34. Qui est a terra panis, percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia.

§ Orig. in Matt. xv. t. 2. p. 27. Sanctificatur per verbum Dei, perque obsecrationem.

‖ Cyril. Catech. Myst. 3. n. 3. Μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

the invocation it is no longer bare bread, but the body of Christ: as the holy oil is not bare oil after the invocation, but the gift of Christ. So, again,* after we have sanctified ourselves by those spiritual hymns, we then pray the merciful God, that He would send forth His Holy Spirit upon the elements lying upon the altar, that He may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ. Which manifestly declares that the consecration was made by prayer and invocation. And the same is implied by St. Basil,† when he asks, which of the saints hath left us in writing the words of the invocation, by which the bread of the Eucharist and the cup of blessing is consecrated? Gregory Nyssen,‡ St. Basil's brother, says, the bread is sanctified by the word of God and prayer. Theophylus of Alexandria, that the bread and wine, which represent the Lord's body and blood upon the table, are consecrated by invocation, and coming of the Holy Ghost§ upon them. And Theodoret, most plainly in one of his dialogues,‖ what do you call the gift that is offered, before the priest has made the invocation over it? Bread made of such seeds. What do you call it after sanctification? The body of Christ. The Latin fathers are as plain in their verdict. St. Ambrose says,¶ the sacraments which we take, are transformed into flesh and blood by the mystery of holy prayer. And Optatus,** describing the fury of the Donatists, asserts the same when he asks them, what greater sacrilege they could be guilty of, than to pull down the altars of God, where God Almighty was invocated, and the Holy Spirit came down at the supplication of

* Id. Catech. Myst. 5. n. 5.

† Basil. de Spir. Sancto, cap. 27.

‡ Nyssen. Orat. Catechetic. cap. 37.

§ Theoph. Ep. Paschal. 1. Panem Dominicum, quo Salvatoris corpus ostenditur, &c., per invocationem et adventum Sancti Spiritus consecrari.

‖ Theodor. Dial. 2. t. 4. p. 85.

¶ Ambros. de Fide, lib. 4. cap. 5. Quotiescunque sacramenta sumimus, quæ per sacræ orationis mysterium in carnem transfigurantur et sanguinem, mortem Domini annunciamus.

** Optat. lib. 6. p. 93. Quid tam sacrilegum, quam altaria Dei frangere—quo Deus omnipotens invocatus sit, et postulatus descendit Spiritus Sanctus?

the priest? St. Jerom* says, it was the peculiar office of the presbyters to consecrate the body and blood of Christ by prayer. And again, that prayer was necessary for this purpose.† The author of the books *De Sacramentis*, under the name of St. Ambrose,‡ gives us the very form of words used in this prayer: make this our oblation a chosen, rational, acceptable oblation, which is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Juvencus§ says, Christ Himself consecrated it by prayer. And Gregory the Great‖ was of opinion, that the apostles used only the Lord's Prayer as the form of their consecration. And Cyprian probably was of the same opinion; for he thinks, that petition in the Lord's Prayer, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' may be understood both in a spiritual¶ and common sense, to denote the body of Christ, which is our bread, that we pray may be given us every day. A great many other Fathers speak of the** benediction or thanksgiving as that which consecrates the Eucharist. Which is not much different from this; for the thanksgiving was always a part of the Eucharistical prayers. And, therefore, some join them both together, as Justin Martyr and Irenæus, in the places now mentioned. And so Origen††

* Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagrium. Ad quorum preces Christi corpus sanguisque conficitur.

† Id. Com. in Zephan. cap. 3. p. 98. Εὐχαριστίαν imprecantis facere verba, &c.

‡ Ambros. de Sacram. lib. 4. cap. 5. Vis scire, quia verbis cœlestibus consecratur? Accipe quæ sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos: Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem ascriptam, rationalem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.

§ Juvencus, Hist. Evangel. lib. 4. Bibl. Patr. t. 8 p. 654. Sancteque precatus, discipulos docuit proprium se tradere corpus.

‖ Greg. lib. 7. Ep. 63. Orationem Dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus, quia mos apostolorum fuit, ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent.

¶ Cypr. de Orat. p. 146. Quod potest et spiritualiter et simpliciter intelligi—quia Christus noster panis est. Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus.

** Tertul. cont. Marcion. lib. 1 cap. 23. Clem. Alex. Pædagog. lib. 2. cap. 2. Chrys. Hom. 82. in Matt. Victor. Antioch. in Marc. xiv. Facundus Hermianensis Defens. Trium Capitulor. lib. 9. Cyril. Alexandrin. Com. in Esa. xxv. item passim in Glaphyris super Genes. Exod. Levit. styles it *eulogia*, which is the same as Eucharist or benediction. Vid. Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 21.

†† Orig. cont. Cels. lib. 8. p. 390. Μετὰ εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς, κ.τ.λ.

tells Celsus, that by thanksgiving and prayer they made bread a holy body, sanctifying such as received and eat it with a pure mind. And St. Austin, who in some places calls it barely the benediction* or thanksgiving, in other places says more expressly that the Eucharist was consecrated by prayer: we call that the body of Christ,† which is taken from the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by mystical prayer in a solemn manner, and so received by us unto salvation, in memory of our Lord's suffering for us. And writing against the Donatists,‡ who denied the validity of the sacraments when they were consecrated and administered by sinners, he asks them, how then does God hear a murderer, when He prays either over the water of baptism, or the oil for unction, or over the Eucharist, or over the heads of those that receive imposition of hands? Implying, that the consecration of the Eucharist, as well as the rest of the things mentioned, was performed by prayer."—*Ant. bk. xv. c. 3. s. xi.*

The next point to which I shall direct attention in the liturgies, and the last, is that of *the offering*. As has been already shewn, the ancient Church was wont to call not only the Eucharistic service, but all divine services whatever, by the name of *sacrifices*. But there were other senses in which the former was specially so called. First, because the communicants made direct offerings of a portion of their substance for the worship of God, and for the poorer brethren; and next, because the whole service was a commemoration of the great sacrifice on the cross. It will be found that the ancient liturgies are formed expressly on this idea. All the three proprieties of the name are again and again brought out in the course of the prayers, and the blessing of God sought upon *the gifts* themselves and upon those who offered them, that such

* Aug. Ep. 59, ad Paulin.

† Aug. de Trinitate, lib. 3. cap. 4. Corpus Christi dicimus illud, quod ex frugibus terræ acceptum, et mystica prece consecratum rite, sumimus ad spiritalem salutem, in memoriam Dominicæ pro nobis passionis.

‡ De Baptismo, lib. 5. cap. 20. Quomodo ergo exaudit homicidam deprecantem, vel super aquam baptismi, vel super oleum, vel super Eucharistiam, vel super capita eorum quibus manus imponitur?

of the former as were to be used in the peculiar service of the Holy Supper, might be the means of communicating what they signified to the worthy participator. But the drift of the liturgies will be best seen by giving a few extracts from them, and I think it will be abundantly manifest that, while the early Church did not hesitate to give such names as *offering*, *oblation*, and *sacrifice*, to the whole service and to its several parts, yet there is not the least foundation for concluding, from these compositions themselves, that those who used them had any such idea as that they were offering Christ as upon the cross; that it was the same sacrifice, not repeated, indeed, but continued, by the same priest; and that it was a true propitiation for the sins both of the living and the dead. I will proceed, then, to give my quotations, leaving the reader to discriminate generally the application in each individual case.

I shall begin with the liturgy of St. James; *i.e.*, of the Church of Jerusalem, of which he was the first bishop. There, in the beginning of the sacramental office, the priest prays, "Δέσποτα κύριε Ἰησοῦ," &c. "O Lord Jesus Christ . . purge us from all sin, and grant that we may present ourselves pure before Thy altar, that we may offer unto Thee the sacrifice of praise," &c. Ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτορ, &c. "O Almighty God, who givest us access to the holy of holies . . fearing, and trembling to approach Thy holy altar, we implore Thy goodness. Send down Thy grace upon us, and sanctify our souls, bodies, and spirits . . that we may offer these gifts, presents, and sacrifices, with a pure conscience," &c. Ὁ ἱερεὺς εἰσάγων τὰ ἅγια ἐῶρα, &c. "The priest who brings in the holy gifts shall say this prayer." Ὁ ἐπισκεψάμενος, &c. "O Lord, who hast visited us in mercy and pity, and given us poor sinners, and Thine unworthy servants, leave to come unto Thy holy altar, and offer this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice for our sins, &c. . . . And of Thy goodness receive me, who approach Thy holy altar; and grant that these gifts, offered by my hands, may be made acceptable to Thee," &c. Καὶ τὰ περικείμενα τῇ ἱερᾷ ταύτῃ τελετῇ, &c. "And uncovering the secret

meaning, which is symbolically veiled in this holy sacrifice, shew it clearly to us," &c. And then in the prayer of consecration, Μεμνημένοι οὖν, &c. "We sinners, therefore, being mindful of His sufferings, offer unto Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice. Have mercy upon us, O Lord, and send down Thy most holy Spirit upon these gifts which are set before Thee . . . that descending upon them, He may, by His holy, gracious, and glorious presence, make this bread the holy body of Christ, and this cup His precious blood." Ὑπὲρ τῶν προσκομισθέντων &c. "Let us pray unto God for these sanctified, precious, heavenly, ineffable, pure, glorious, tremendous, dreadful, and divine oblations, that our Lord would receive them into His holy, heavenly, intellectual, and spiritual altar, for a sweet-smelling savour," &c. Ὁ θεὸς καὶ πάτηρ τοῦ κυρίου, &c. "O God the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who hast received the gifts, presents, and sacrifices offered unto Thee for a sweet-smelling savour, and hast vouchsafed to sanctify, and consecrate them by the grace of Thy Christ, and the descent of Thy most holy Spirit; O sanctify also our souls, bodies, and spirits," &c.

So in the liturgy of St. Mark, or the Church of Alexandria, at the beginning of the oblation: "O Lord our God, who art our Sovereign Lord; who hast made all things by Thy wisdom, the true light; Thy only-begotten Son, our Lord and God, and only Saviour Jesus Christ, through whom, giving thanks to Thee, and with Thy holy Spirit, we offer this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, which all nations offer up unto Thee from the rising of the sun unto the setting thereof; from the north to the south; because great is Thy name among all people, and incense, and sacrifice, and oblation, is offered unto Thee in every place. Καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν μερίδα, &c. "And grant that we may have our part and lot with all Thy saints, who bring unto Thee sacrificial oblations. And, O God, receive up these Eucharistical gifts into Thy heavenly and intellectual altar." Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δώρων, &c. "O Lord our God, we have set what are Thine of Thy own gifts before Thee; and we pray and beseech Thee, O bountiful lover of

mankind, to send down from the height of Thy holy place, from Thy prepared tabernacle, from Thy infinite bosoms [of love] the Paraclete Himself, the Spirit of Truth, the holy, quickening Lord, who spake in the law, and the prophets, and apostles; who is every where present, and fills all things; and worketh not ministerially, but by His own power and holiness, according to Thy good pleasure, in whom He will; who is simple by nature, but manifold in his operations; who is the Fountain of divine gifts and graces, consubstantial to Thee, and proceeding from Thee, and sits with Thee and Thy only-begotten Son, and our Lord, and God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in the throne of Thy kingdom. O send down this holy Spirit upon us, and upon these loaves and these cups; that, as God omnipotent, He may sanctify and consecrate them, and make this bread the body, and the cup the blood of the New Testament of our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King of Kings, Jesus Christ."

Very similar are the words of St. Chrysostom's liturgy:

"Send down, O Lord, Thy assistance from Thy holy habitation, and strengthen me in Thy service, which I am going to perform, that I may stand without blame before Thy tremendous altar, and minister the unbloody sacrifice," &c. So, in the prayer at the *πρόθεσις*, or table, where the people's oblations of bread and wine were set, before they were brought to the altar of Thy goodness and love for mankind, remember those who have offered, and those for whom they have offered. So in the prayer for the communicants: "O Lord, the God of powers, we give thanks to Thee, who hast deemed us worthy to appear at Thy altar to supplicate Thy mercy for our sins, and the errors of Thy people: O God receive our prayer, and make us worthy to offer up to Thee prayers, and supplications, and unbloody sacrifices for all Thy people," &c. So in the Cherubic hymn or prayer, who out of Thy ineffable and immense love of mankind, wast made man not by conversion, or confusion (of substance), and hast been declared our high-priest by God, and as Lord of all hast instituted the ministration of this unbloody sacrifice, &c. . . . "To Thee

do I come, and beseech Thee not to turn Thy face from me, nor to reject me from among Thy children, but graciously permit that these gifts may be offered up by me a sinner." So in the prayer after the oblations are placed upon the altar: "O Lord God Almighty, who only art holy, and who receivest the sacrifice of praise from those who call upon Thee with their whole heart, receive the prayer of us sinners, and bring it to Thy holy altar, and make us worthy to offer up these gifts and spiritual sacrifices for our sins, and the errors of the people, and grant we may find grace in Thy sight to have this our sacrifice made acceptable to Thee." Then after the *sursum corda*, and the prayer of thanksgiving, mentioned by Justin Martyr, and the words of the institution, the priest saith: "Wherefore, remembering this salutary commandment, and all the things that are done for us: His death, burial, resurrection on the third day, His ascension into heaven, His sitting at Thy right hand, and His second and glorious coming, we offer Thy own [gifts or creatures] unto Thee. We also offer up unto Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, and we pray and beseech Thee to send down Thy holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts. Amen."

"Make this bread the precious [mystical] body of Thy Christ, Amen. And what is in this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ, changing [them] by Thy holy Spirit." Then in a prayer after the Lord's Prayer: "Thou, therefore, O Lord, bless these gifts which are set before Thee to us all, according to every one's necessity," &c.

"So in the liturgy of St. Basil, in the prayer at the *prothesis*, upon which the oblations were set: "Bless this table, and the oblations thereupon, and receive them up unto Thy altar in the highest heavens; and of Thy goodness and love towards men, remember the offerers, and those for whom they have offered, and preserve us free from all sin in the administration of these holy mysteries," &c. So in the prayer of the priest, after the offerings are set on the holy table, or altar: "May it please Thee, O Lord, as we are ministers of the New Testament, and liturgs of Thy holy mysteries, according to the multitude of Thy mercies, to

receive us who are approaching to Thy holy altar, that we may be worthy to offer unto Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice for our sins, and the errors of the people. Which Thou having received up for a sweet savour to Thy holy and intellectual altar, send down for it the grace of Thy Holy Spirit upon us. Look upon us, O Lord, and upon this our sacrifice, and receive it as Thou didst receive the oblations of Abel, the sacrifices of Noah, the holocausts of Abraham, the consecration-offerings of Moses and Aaron, the peace-offerings of Samuel, even as Thou didst receive this Eucharistical oblation, the verity of them, from Thy holy apostles; let us stand as becomes us, with reverence, and take heed that we offer this holy offering in peace."

"Wherefore, most holy Lord, . . . we approach to Thy holy altar, and having set [thereupon] the figures [or symbols] of the holy body and blood of Thy Christ, we pray and beseech Thee, O most holy, by the pleasure of Thy goodness, that Thy holy Spirit may come upon us, and upon these gifts lying before Thee, to bless them, and sanctify them, and make them the body and blood of Christ."

"Thou, O our God, who hast received these gifts, cleanse us from all filthiness of flesh and spirit," &c.

Also, in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, we have the terms used with the same reference, and not at all in the modern Popish sense. In this liturgy "the Canon of the Mass" thus commences:

"Wherefore, O most merciful Father, we humbly pray and beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son our Lord, that Thou wouldst accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy, pure sacrifices, which we offer up to Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church . . . . Wherefore we beseech Thee that Thou wouldst graciously receive this oblation of our service, and of Thy whole family. Which oblation we beseech Thee that it may please Thee to make blessed, appropriated, approved, rational, and acceptable, that it may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord." In the treatise *de Sacra-*

mentis, falsely ascribed to St. Ambrose, but written by some orthodox author of the ninth century, the words of this prayer are these which follow:—"Vis scire quia verbis cœlestibus consecratur? Accipe quæ sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos: fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod sit in figuram corporis, et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi." In this prayer to God to appropriate, ratify, and accept the elements to be offered, and thereby to become the figurative or mystical body and blood of Christ, the words *benedictam* and *ratam* are omitted; but in the *present canon* of the Roman mass they are as in the Sacramentary of Gregory I.: "Wherefore, O Lord, we, Thy servants and Thy holy people, being mindful of Thy Son our God, and of His blessed passion; also of his resurrection from the dead, and His glorious ascension into heaven, offer unto Thy glorious majesty a pure, holy, and spotless sacrifice of Thy own gifts and benefits, the holy bread of eternal life, and the cup of everlasting salvation; upon which, we beseech Thee, look with a propitious and serene countenance, and vouchsafe to accept them, as Thou didst receive the oblations of thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and the holy sacrifice, that immaculate host, which Melchisedec, Thy high priest, offered to Thee. And we humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command that these [oblations] be carried up by the hands of angels unto Thy heavenly altar in Thy sight; that as many of us as have partaken of the body and blood of Thy Son at this altar, may be filled with Thy benediction and grace, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

So in the *Codices Sacramentorum*, published at Rome by Joseph Maria Thomasius, 1680, which are ancient offices, written about the latter end of the eighth century; in which, omitting all the prayers of the priest, I shall only cite the words in the canon of the celebration of the Eucharist, where, after *Sursum Corda*, &c., "Lift up your hearts." *Ans.:* "We lift them up unto the Lord. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God." *A.:* "It is meet and right so to do." Then it follows, Et justum est, æquum,

et salutare, &c. "It is meet, right, and for our comfort, that we should always, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, holy Father Almighty, and eternal God." &c. Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Jesum Christum filium tuum, &c. "We therefore, most merciful Father, humbly pray and beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ Thy Son, our Lord: Uti accepta habeas, et benedicas hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata, &c. "That Thou wouldst accept and bless these oblations, these gifts, these holy, unspotted sacrifices, which, in the first place, we offer unto Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church." &c. Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ, &c. "We therefore pray Thee, O Lord, that it may please Thee to accept this oblation of our bounden duty and service, and of Thy whole family," &c. Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quæsumus benedictam, ascriptam, &c. "Which oblation we beseech Thee, O God, being blessed, appropriated, &c., Thou wouldst vouchsafe to make acceptable, that it may be unto us the body and blood of Thy Son, our Lord and God, Jesus Christ." And then after the words of the institution: Unde et memores, &c. "Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, and also Thy holy people, being mindful of the blessed passion of Thy Son, our Lord God," &c. Offerimus præclaræ Majestati tuæ de tuis donis, ac datis hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, &c. "We offer unto Thy glorious Majesty of Thy own gifts and benefits, a pure, holy, immaculate sacrifice, the bread of eternal life, and the cup of everlasting salvation, upon which we beseech Thee to look with a propitious countenance, and to accept them, as Thou didst the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel." &c.

Now, from these examples of the mode in which the words *offering*, *oblation*, and *sacrifice* are used in the liturgies, in every one of which, I think, I am justified in saying, the words are used in one of the three senses above referred to—*i.e.*, either of the *prayers*, of the *gifts* as presented on the altar, or of the *commemoration* of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross,—is it too much to conclude, that the Popish idea of the mass, which has

been adopted and taught so freely in the English Church, by Mr. Wilberforce and others, was never thought of by the primitive Church? Nay, is it not manifest, from the older forms of the present Roman missal, and from much that remains in it to-day, that such an idea as is now adopted by that Church is new and an ingraft? If this be proved, I do not see how any stronger case could be made out against any particular error than is made out against this. For to suppose that we should find passages directly against the "developments" of modern heresy, is evidently absurd. It was not possible for objections to be made to a doctrine before that doctrine itself was promulgated.* Nor, indeed, is it very reasonable to expect any cautionary intimations from those whose tendency was rather towards excess in the other direction, who, in truth, did not see the "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits" of the "Mystery of Iniquity" to which, alas! their own unguarded, and sometimes dangerous, phraseology ultimately led, and for which it is now quoted in proof and support. It is, I think, enough, amply enough, for condemnation of both, that neither the adoration of the host, nor the reality of a propitiatory offering in it, is mentioned in these liturgies. It is not within the bounds of probability, scarcely of possibility, that *the two* most important matters in the Eucharist should have been, not only not most explicitly stated, but left to obscure hints and innuendos, if not entirely omitted. If this be a subsidiary ordinance of the Christian religion, valuable for its commemorative significance, as well as because it is "an effectual means of grace," we should expect to find it just what we have it: but if it be *the* means of grace, the great antitype of all the Jewish sacri-

* There is one point of view, however, in which the error of Rome on the Eucharist becomes more striking, and that is when we consider the great pains which that Church now takes to secure adoration for the elements. Not only is there the strong contrast afforded between the old and the modern form of the canon of the mass, wherein, anciently, there was no trace of adoration, though now it is expressly enjoined, both on priest and people, in every possible form: but we have, further, a special festival, that of *corpus Christi*, lately instituted in honour of the sacrament. The different conduct of the latter Church, compared with that of the earlier, affords very strong presumptive evidence that their faith is as different as their practice.

fices, the perpetuation of the mysterious and eventful tragedy of Calvary, and the continued application of the incarnation of the Son of God ; then the Bible is, indeed, a *dark* book, and we stand in need of another revelation to explain the last. Then, to the virtual exclusion of spiritual worship and heartfelt devotion, forms, and ceremonies, and the *opus operatum* are the things acceptable to God, who no longer holds His throne in light, where happy myriads of bright spirits adore Him; but, though He refuses to be worshipped in the glorious Sun, is to be bowed down to in a drop of wine or a mouse-eaten wafer, or, lower still, and I blush while my pen writes it, in our own loathsome excrement. Oh, gracious God ! how long ?

CHAPTER VII.

THE FATHERS UPON THE EFFECTS OF CONSECRATION.

I HAVE before expressed my surprise at so much having been said about the ancient liturgies, as to their age and their authority, and so little use having been made of them afterwards. They are hardly referred to or quoted for the establishment of any point which the Archdeacon advocates, or for the refutation of any opinion to which he is antagonistic. He has endeavoured to increase their authority, by greatly extending the antiquity of our present copies, and then seems to leave it quietly to be implied that they, without question, teach all that he would have us believe. I think I have satisfactorily shewn, that that is not by any means the case ; but, on the contrary, that these venerable forms of the ancient service are thoroughly antagonistic to the whole Popish scheme, which is once again being propounded for our acceptance.

Forsaking, then, the liturgies (I conclude, because he felt that they were against him), Mr. Wilberforce betakes himself to the Fathers; and, although I have before shewn what are their opinions of the Eucharist in some points of view ; yet, perhaps, I ought to follow my opponent, and examine the passages which he has brought. If it can be shewn that the Fathers speak a different language from that which I have adduced from them, still it will not prove that Mr. Wilberforce's doctrine is correct, but that the witnesses are not worthy of credit—since they contradict one another, if not themselves. I must confess, however, that I have no such fears. I believe that the absurdities and mon-

strosities of Popery were never present to the minds of the ancient Christian writers, whose works have descended to us; and I enter upon the course in which the Archdeacon leads, without the slightest apprehension that I shall find him recognised by those primitive worthies, however anxious he may prove to allege their countenance, and claim their society.

In passing, then, from the liturgies to the Fathers, Mr. Wilberforce thus speaks:—

"So much respecting the ancient liturgies, and the proofs which they afford (where are they? I have found none), that the gift bestowed in the Holy Eucharist is bestowed through the elements. We now come to the next head of arguments, the direct statements of ancient writers, that the efficacy of the Holy Eucharist depends upon the change which consecration effects in the elements. From which it would seem to be a necessary inference, that it is through the elements themselves that the benefit conveyed in this ordinance is communicated. The language of ancient writers on this subject is less uniformly explicit seemingly than it would be, because their habitual unwillingness to expose sacred subjects to the profaneness of the heathen, restricted the express mention of that to which they allude."

So that it appears the Archdeacon is not so sure of his ground as he would at first have us believe. He is, undoubtedly, quite right in saying that the Fathers are not "uniformly explicit" on the subject of his effete heresy. He thinks, however, that he can find four ancient authors, to whom he can refer with perfect confidence, in whose case "grounds for reserve did not exist. In the catechetical lectures, therefore, of St. Ambrose, St. Cyril, St. Gregory Nyssen, and St. Gaudentius, we find express statements of the change which consecration was supposed to make in the holy elements." But even with respect to these, his own selected and approved witnesses, he thinks it needful to caution us, lest we mistake their meaning. "So forcible," says he, "are their expressions, that it is necessary to add, by way of caution, that they must not be supposed to have admitted any *carnal* presence of Christ,—*i.e.*, any such presence as that He could be an object to the senses." Protestants would have said, "*i.e.*, not any *cor-*

poreal presence at all." It might have occurred to any one feeling it necessary to give the caution which is given by Mr. Wilberforce, that the whole of these expressions are simply figurative or hyperbolical.

A beginning is made with St. Ambrose,* who, "after speaking of the regenerating force of baptism, goes on to affirm, that in the Holy Eucharist is vouchsafed the real presence of Christ's body and blood:

'You may, perhaps, say, that which I see is something different: how do you prove to me that I receive the body of Christ? This is what it remains for me to prove. What examples, therefore, am I to use? Let me prove that this is not that which nature has made it, but that which the benediction has consecrated it to be: and that the force of the benediction is greater than that of nature, because by the benediction nature herself is changed.'†

"And then, after citing various instances from the Old Testament, in which an external element had been made the means of conferring an inward gift, and of the influence exercised by the one upon the other, ending with the mystery of the incarnation, he concludes:

'Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself proclaims, *this is my body*. Before the sacred words of benediction, another species is named, after consecration the body *is implied*. He Himself speaks of His blood. Before consecration it is spoken of as another thing. After consecration *it is named* blood. And you' (*i.e.*, the receiver) 'say Amen—that is, it is true. What your mouth expresses, let your inner mind confess—feel what you say.'"‡

One might have supposed, that the second of these quotations, made from St. Ambrose, would have sufficiently explained his meaning, and have shewn that he spoke figuratively. There is a sense, undoubtedly, in which every word quoted is strictly true, but it is in a figurative one only. If we attempt to bind down these expressions to a literal interpretation, they become at once heretical in themselves, and at variance with other parts of the

* See Doct. H. Euch. pp. 62—66. † De Mysteriis. ix. 50. ‡ Ibid. 54.

same author's writings. The folly, however, of thus interpreting by the strictness of the letter the expressions quoted, was shewn long since by Bishop Stillingfleet, in a review of the whole passage:

"1. St. Ambrose," says the bishop, "doth parallel the change in the Eucharist with that in baptism; and to prove regeneration therein, he argues from the miraculous conception of Christ in the womb of the virgin; but in baptism nobody supposes the substance of the water to be taken away; and therefore it cannot hold as to the other, from the supernatural change, which may be only with respect to such a divine influence, which it had not before consecration. 2. He doth purposely talk obscurely and mystically about this matter, as the Fathers were wont to do to those who were to be admitted to these mysteries. Sometimes one would think he meant that the elements are changed into Christ's individual body born of the virgin; and yet, presently after, he distinguishes between the true flesh of Christ, which was crucified and buried, and the sacrament of His flesh. If this were the same, what need any distinction? And that this *sacramentum carnis,* is meant of the Eucharist, is plain by what follows; for he cites Christ's words, 'This is my body.' 3. He best explains his own meaning, when he saith, not long after, 'That the body of Christ in the sacrament is a spiritual body, or a body produced by the Divine Spirit;' and so he parallels it with that spiritual food, which the Israelites did eat in the wilderness: and no man will say that the substance of the manna was then lost. And since your authors make the same St. Ambrose to have written the book *De Sacramentis,* there is a notable passage therein, which helps to explain this; for there he saith expressly, 'Non iste panis est qui vadit in corpus, sed ille panis vitæ æternæ qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit.' 'It is not the bread which passes into the body, but the bread of eternal life, which strengthens the substance of our soul.' Where he not only calls it bread after consecration, which goes to our nourishment; but he distinguishes it from the bread of eternal life, which supports the soul, which must be understood of divine grace, and not of any bodily substance."*

Here, then, we have a full reply to this quotation of the Archdeacon from St. Ambrose. But, to say nothing of the folly of taking every chance phrase of a writer (and that, too, when he is drawing parallels between things which, in many points, do not

* Doc. of the Trin. and Transubst. compared as to scripture, reason, and tradition.

resemble each other), as fixed by the strictest rules of literal interpretation, St. Ambrose explains himself most satisfactorily, when he says, that it is a body only *by implication*, and blood only *in name*. To use such words of the realities of each, would be to destroy the use of language by confounding the real and the ideal, the literal and the figurative, in one hopeless jumble.

The next quotations are from St. Cyril, in which he begs his auditors not to imagine the sacramental bread *mere* bread, nor the consecrated wine a *bare* element, in which Protestants agree with Cyril to the full. He also assures them that, though it escapes sense, the body and blood of Christ are, under them, communicated to the believer. On this point. also, we are agreed. The question which lies between the Papist and the Protestant is not touched by Cyril (as it was impossible it should) : but, as I have already given the whole account of the mode in which this Father celebrated the Eucharist, and also that he frequently calls the bread and wine the *emblems* of the body and blood of Christ,* I shall delay the reader no longer on the consideration of passages already answered, I trust to the entire satisfaction of the ingenuous mind.

The next quotation is also one from a passage of illustration and comparison; and who but knows that it is most fallacious to bring rigid proofs of doctrine from such? The Fathers, as is well known to even the casual student, were wont to run into the grossest excesses in following out some fancied resemblance, which disfigures nearly every ancient Christian writer, and runs riot in Origen and others. Gregory Nyssen (the man now before us), the brother of St. Basil, was gifted largely with the imaginative: and it is when he is indulging tolerably freely in this, his favorite style, that he pens the passage which the Archdeacon has quoted. "St. Gregory Nyssen," says our author, "in his Catechetical Discourse, speaks of the human body of our Lord as exalted by personal union with Deity, and brings this forward as illustrative of the change which befalls the sacred elements:

* See *supra*, pp. 87, 88.

'With reason, therefore, do we believe that the bread, which is now sanctified by the word of God, is transformed into the body of God the Word. For that [natural] body [of our Lord's] was in effect bread [*i.e.*, as he has explained before, bread had been the food by which it had been nourished]. But it was sanctified by the indwelling of the word, which tabernacled in our flesh.'

"This process, then, he compares with the holy Eucharist:

'For there, too, the bread, as the apostle says, is sanctified by the word of God, and by prayer, so that it does not pass into the body of the Word by the process of eating and drinking, but is transformed at once into body by a word, as the word expressed it, saying, "This is my body."'*

"In this manner he says:

'Humanity is made partaker of the divine nature through communion with Deity.'

"And he sums up with the statement that God

'Bestows these gifts, by changing the nature of the apparent elements into that [*i.e.*, the immortal] by the power of the benediction.'"†

It is clear, from the first two of these quotations, that, when Gregory speaks of "the human body of our Lord, as exalted by personal union with Deity, and brings this forward as illustrative of the change which befalls the sacred elements," he does not mean —he could not mean—that the human body of our Lord was changed into Deity, but was *sanctified* by the indwelling of the Word, which tabernacled in it. So, also, when he speaks of a like change taking place in the sacramental elements, he means what he says—"there, too, the bread is *sanctified* by the Word of God and prayer." Thus, in Gregory's idea, as the bread which our Lord ate, and which became by this process his natural body, was exalted by its union with Deity; so the bread of the Eucharist becomes exalted (in a sense, His body,) by that union of it with the Deity which is vouchsafed in answer to prayer. There is, in both cases, a sanctification by connection with Deity, but no change of substance in either.

But the same author, from whom we extracted a review of the

* Cat. Orat. 39. vol. iii. p. 104. † Ibid. 105.

passage in Ambrose, has also reviewed this one from Gregory. He deals with it as follows:

"Gregory Nyssen was a man of fancy, and he shewed it in that catechetical discourse. However, Fronto Ducæus thought it a notable place to prove transubstantiation, which I wonder at, if he attended to the design of it; which was to shew, that as our bodies, by eating, became subject to corruption, so by eating they become capable of immortality; and this, he saith, 'must be by receiving an immortal body into our bodies, such as the body of Christ was. But then,' saith he 'how could that body, which is to remain whole in itself, be distributed to all the faithful over the whole earth?' He answers by saying, 'that our bodies do consist of bread and wine, which are their proper nourishment; and Christ's body being like ours, that was so too; which, by the union with the word of God, was changed into a divine dignity.' But what is this to the Eucharist, you may say? He goes on, therefore, 'so I believe the sanctified bread, by the power of the word of God, to be changed into the body of God the Word.' Not into that individual body, but after the same manner, by a presence of the Λόγος, or God the Word, in it. And that this was his meaning doth evidently appear by what follows:—'For,' saith he, 'that body,—viz., to which He was incarnate,—was sanctified by the inhabitation of the Λόγος, dwelling in the flesh: therefore, as the bread was then changed into a divine dignity in the body, so it is now; and the bread is changed into the body of the Λόγος (not of Jesus Christ), as it was said by the Word, 'This is my body.' And so by receiving this divine body into our bodies, they are made capable of immortality.' And this is the true account of Gregory Nyssen's meaning, which, if it prove anything, proves an impanation, rather than transubstantiation."

Whence it will at once be seen that the conceit of Gregory as to our bodies being rendered immortal, or capable of immortality, by participation of Christ's body,—an idea somewhat modified and spiritualized by the Archdeacon,*—is shallow and absurd. Are

* "Is it not the essential characteristic of the Christian system, that it depends on those two men, in one of whom humanity fell, while it was regenerated in the other? Does not this imply that the cure of human ill must, in some measure, be correspondent to its cause? May we not anticipate the gifts of grace to be bestowed in a manner which is analogous to the incursions of sin? Now, in what manner is corruption propagated among men? The souls of men are believed to be each a separate creation of the Supreme Being; and to become in some way infected with that hereditary taint, which is perpetuated through the propagation of their bodies. If it be affirmed,

none immortal, then, but such as participate of Christ's body in His Supper? What becomes of the wicked? are they annihilated? Where is the B.C.-world with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? If the incarnation has restored immortality to the human family, it has not done it by that flesh being corporeally eaten, but by its divine energy pervading all space, and annihilating all distinction of time. "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," has brought life and immortality to light *by the Gospel.*

"St. Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, is next brought before us with his testimony, which is as follows:

'The Creator and Lord of nature, who produces bread from the earth, of bread again (because it is within His power and His promise) makes His own body: and He who made wine of water, of wine makes His blood.'*

"And again:

'The hereditary gift of the New Testament is that sacrifice which, on the night that He was betrayed to be crucified, He left as the *pledge* of His presence. This is that *viaticum* for our way, by which we are nourished in this journey of life, until departing from this world, we come to Him; by reason of which the same Lord said, "Unless ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you." For He wished that His *benefits should continue* among us: He wished that through *the image of His own passion*, our souls should be always sanctified by His precious blood. He orders, therefore, His faithful disciples, whom He appointed also the first priests of His Church, to solemnize perpetually those mysteries of eternal life, which it is necessary that all priests, throughout every Church of the whole world, should celebrate *till Christ comes again from heaven.* This was done, that we, the priests, and the whole body of the faithful, having *the representation of Christ's passion* daily before our eyes, carrying it in our hands, and receiving it in our mouths and bosoms, might be possessed with an indelible *memorial* of our redemption, and might obtain a sweet medicine

then, that the soul cannot be a channel through which the gift of Christ's presence in the holy Eucharist can affect and modify the whole body, how comes it that a man's own body can produce such effects upon his soul? And that the sanctified body of Christ should be employed as the medium of benefit to the souls of men, is evidently consistent with the analogy, which looks for a resemblance between the poison and the antidote."—Doct. H. Euch. p. 355.

* Ad Neoph. Bib. Pat. Max. v. 946.

and perpetual defence against the venom of the devil. As the Holy Spirit exhorts, "O taste and see how sweet the Lord is.'"*

Of the first quotation I have nothing to remark, having already explained fully on what grounds the sacramental elements were called by the names of the things which they represented, as the Fathers themselves explain at large. And what need can there be to make any remarks upon the second extract? Do not the parts in italics exhibit most clearly the idea of the writer as a Protestant one? Who amongst us but believes that, on the night upon which Christ was betrayed, "He left us *the pledge* of His presence?" Who denies that Christ wished *His benefits* to continue with us? Is it not Protestant doctrine, *and anti-Popish*, to call the sacrament *an image, a representation* of Christ's passion, ordered to be solemnized perpetually as an *indelible memorial* of our redemption, *till Christ comes again* from heaven? Alas, what but judicial blindness could make a man fancy that he saw here the "antitype to the Jewish sacrifices," the *juge sacrificium* of the cross, *awful, august, mysterious, efficacious!* "God shall send them strong delusions, that they should believe a lie," is an awful truth, but often realized.

The nine Propositions respecting the Eucharistic sacrifice, which Mr. Wilberforce proposes to prove, may now be disposed of without much trouble. I will take them seriatim, and see what authority they have; or, if true in themselves, what pretence there is to build up Popish doctrine upon them.

The first proposition, then, is: "The thing offered in the Holy Eucharist is the *body of Christ.*" This proposition is proved by the combination of half-a-dozen *scraps* from Cyril and Augustine, Chrysostom and Ambrose, in the same manner as the Bible is made to command suicide: "Judas went and hanged himself;" "Go and do thou likewise."

There is no doctrine so monstrous, but may be proved in this way, and from any source; and the Archdeacon's performance is

* Ad Neoph. Bib. Pat. Max. v. 947.

neither more respectable nor more conclusive than the preceding example. I have already shewn in what sense the Fathers call the Eucharist "the body of Christ," and how they use the phrases "offering the body of Christ;" "make this bread the body of thy Christ," &c. So I shall give no more proofs—*quantum sufficit* is better than *ad nauseam*.

Second proposition: "The sacrifice offered in the Holy Eucharist is affirmed not to be anything superadded to that on the cross, nor yet a repetition of it." To prove this point were unnecessary, as we all give our fullest assent to it. It is proved, however, by a long quotation from St. Chrysostom, beginning thus: "What, then, do we not offer every day? Certainly we do: but *to make a memorial of His death*. And *this memorial* is one, and not many," &c.; which concludes, speaking of the connection of the sacrifice of the altar with that on the cross, "This happens *in memory* of that which then took place. For, 'do this,' He says, '*in memory* of me.' It is not a different sacrifice as the High Priest presented in former times; but we offer the same, *or, rather, we perform a memorial of that sacrifice*."* What better Protestant doctrine would one wish to read? Is it honest to bind Chrysostom to the expression, we offer *the same* sacrifice, when he says that the expression is inaccurate, and is better expressed by *a memorial* of that sacrifice? But this is Popery. "Speaking lies in hypocrisy" is a faithful characteristic of that system, and of all who give in their allegiance to it. Another spurious passage given, it is needless to notice, though it says that the Christian sacrifice was instituted that "the victim might *live continually in memory*, and be always *present by grace*." We are quite satisfied that it is so.

Third proposition: "The victim offered in the Holy Eucharist was said to be identical with Him who offered it." Passages quoted from St. Ambrose and St. Cyril to establish this point, are to be interpreted exactly on the same principle as that on which

* In Epist. ad Hebr. xvii 3.

any *offering* is spoken of, or Christ is said to be *the victim*. Such expressions are true, figuratively, sacramentally, memorially, as the Fathers themselves abundantly affirm; in their literal significance they are false and heretical.

Fourth proposition: "It was the habitual custom of ancient writers to speak of the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist as awful, august, and terrible." No doubt it was. In this they ran even to excess, and used language, occasionally, which neither truth nor reason could justify. But they did the same of baptism, of confirmation, and of other sacred rites, which only proves either that the Fathers were very devout, or that their piety was deeply tinged with superstition. We do not find such *excessive* statements in the mouths of the apostles, nor even in the writings of the earlier Fathers. The comparative silence of the former, and the "brevity" of the latter, are both acknowledged and lamented by Mr. Wilberforce.

In reply to the fifth proposition,—viz., that the altar sacrifice is called *efficacious*,—it is sufficient to remark, that the prayers and praises, and pleading of Christ's death, have always, as now, been considered *efficacious*. "The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," is at once a sanction for, and an explanation of, such language, respecting the most solemn service of the Christian Church.

Sixth proposition: "The sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist is declared to have been that which the Jewish ordinances were intended to typify." When Mr. Wilberforce says, *were intended to typify*, he says much more than his proofs support, though, perhaps, not more than the Fathers sometimes assert, and we, too, often declare. When it is said, in the Apostolical Constitutions, that our Lord, instead of *daily* baptism, gave *one* to His Church; instead of one tribe for priesthood, He appointed the best of every nation; instead of bloody sacrifices, He has given us a reasonable, bloodless, mystical one; I find no sign of *intention to typify* manifested. I see comparison and contrast, such as our divines now constantly make; and it must be confessed that

we go even much further than this, and sometimes declare those things, which have a certain real or fancied resemblance in the Old and New Testaments, as types and antitypes one of another. There can be no doubt but that the Christian sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving has superseded the Jewish sacrifices; but, to say that the former were *intended* to typify the latter, would not be true: St. Paul shews, that they had their antitype in the sacrifice of the cross.

The same remarks will meet the case of the seventh proposition, which is the sixth in other words.

Eighth proposition: "To offer the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, is declared to be an especial office committed to the apostles and their successors." Who would wonder at passages innumerable being found to prove that the ministerial office had the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in charge? If there be a ministry at all, doubtless it must take cognizance of the most solemn rite of that religion which it serves. But will this prove aught for Mr. Wilberforce? I confess I cannot see how. When I turn to the writings of one better than the best of the Fathers, I cannot find so much made of this particular ministerial act, as Mr. Wilberforce would make of it. Listen to St. Paul: "And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," (*Eph.* iv., 11, 12.) I think the apostle would have spoken differently, had he been impressed with the views of the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist."

Here there is no mention of, or allusion to, that which we are told was the *special office* of the ministry. Can any one imagine the apostle so ignorant as not to know, or so thoughtless as not to mention, the chief duty of even his own office? These are entirely impossible suppositions; so that no other conclusion can be drawn from his omission of such reference than this, that he knew not of, and *therefore* did not notice, the claims and pretensions which are now paraded for a *proper sacrificial ministry*.

But, in conclusion, we are assured, that as the Church of Christ is called the body of Christ, so it also is offered in the sacramental oblation. "It is the offering up of the collective Church, Christ's mystical body, but it is also the offering up of Christ Himself, by whom that body is sanctified." We have seen that this idea is St. Augustine's,* who has given us with it very fully his view of Christian sacrifices.

Now, in what sense can it be said that the Christian Church is offered on the altar to God the Father? Are they—is it, offered in a *figure, or* in the *reality* of human nature? It is hard to conceive any one so mad as to assert, that the sacrifice is real, not virtual—in the truth of human nature, and not in a figure. Yet in what way Christ's mystical body, the Church, is sacrificed, in the same is His own true body offered on the altar. Neither is offered up as though anything could be added to the sacrifice of the cross, or as though that sacrifice required renewal. The blood-stained sacrifice, which the one great High Priest for ever pleads before the Father's throne, admits neither of increase nor repetition. "For in the Church of God," as Leo the Great says, "which is the body of Christ, neither is the priesthood valid, nor the sacrifice real (*i e.*, neither of them avails anything), unless the true High Priest in our very nature reconciles us; unless we are washed in the true blood of the spotless Lamb. Who, although He be placed at the Father's right hand, yet, (there) in the same flesh which He took of the virgin, carries out the sacrament of our propitiation; as the apostle says, 'Jesus Christ, who is dead, yea, rather, who is risen from the dead, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.'" Nothing can be more sound, and scriptural, and Protestant, than this language of Leo's; but it is all perverted by the pretence that his words mean, that the *same flesh* which Christ took of the virgin *is in the sacrament:* a meaning which Leo intended not, and the words will not bear without violence. Leo's meaning is fixed

* See Appendix F, p. lxxi. *ad finem.*

by the quotation from the apostle; and it does seem strange that any one should be so blinded as to write of this whole passage, "He who has been consecrated a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, chooses this medium—*i.e.*, through the elements of the Eucharist—for giving effect to his perpetual intercession." Indeed, I do not think that Leo at all alludes to the Eucharist in this passage, but calls our Lord's perpetual intercession in heaven, "the carrying out of the sacrament of our propitiation;" a figure beautiful in itself, and strictly appropriate.

CHAPTER VIII.

A CONSIDERATION OF SOME PARTICULAR USAGES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH RESPECTING THE EUCHARIST.

I PROCEED, in the last place, to consider certain usages of the ancient Church, which are alleged as confirming the assumption that the words of consecration impressed not only a sacred character upon the elements, but also made them *really* the body and blood of Christ, in the most literal sense of the words. I shall first consider those brought forward by the Archdeacon as confirmatory of his views, and then state such as, in my opinion, go quite in the opposite direction. The mode of inquiry seems a fair one to arrive at the opinion of those concerned, as to the sacredness, whether relative or positive, of the sacramental elements. It is hardly to be expected, however, that we shall be able to gather from these usages the *amount* or *kind* of sanctity which was considered to appertain to the elements, by the persons who observed them.

Indeed, I do not see how it is possible for inanimate and irrational things to have any inherent, positive holiness at all; while it is evident enough that rational creatures may have. Take the case of any one thing whatever which we call *holy*, and it cannot be said that it is so in and of itself. A church, though a consecrated building, is not *thus* holy—it is only so in its relative aspect, as devoted, set apart for the service of God. Its materials are no better than those of any similar building, whether considered separately or in the aggregate. It is in its relationship that it is to be called holy, and considered possessed of a sacred character.

So also of that book called the Bible, the day known as the Sabbath, the person who is baptized, simply so considered. These are all *holy* in a sense,—not inherently so, but relatively. The case, however, is very different when we come to consider the immortal part of a reasoning being. There positive holiness, or its absence, may be realized. There is such a thing as a saint and a sinner, in the reality of the nature of each; and the Deity and the devil stand apart by the necessary repulsion of their opposing natures. When, therefore, we are told that "consecration is a mockery, unless the *elements* be rendered sacred," we wish to know what is meant, and "withhold our consent" till we are informed. In reply, then, to the following series of questions:

"How is it possible that those who admit the reality of consecration should deny the efficacy of the elements? For is it not for this very purpose that they are set apart? With what intention can they be consecrated, except that they should be effectual? Why is *this* especial portion separated from the element at large, except to be the medium of a blessing? What other conclusion can reason dictate? for why should they be subjected to this ordinance, unless they are the recipients of its effect?"

We answer, why is a form of consecration observed, and why is a separation of a special portion from the element in general made, in the case of the water in baptism and of the materials of a church? Why are the twenty-four hours of the Sabbath separated from profane uses and sanctified by divine command? The answer in all these cases will be the same. There may be different degrees of sacredness in the Christian offices to which these several dedications or consecrations refer, but the nature and the amount of sanctity in the external elements must be the same in all.

We proceed now to consider those usages which are said to manifest the supposition, "that the elements themselves underwent some change, by virtue of our Lord's words, and the power of the Holy Ghost; and that, through the consecration bestowed upon them, they became the media of a certain mysterious benefit." The first mentioned is this:—

"It appears to have been a custom from the very first for bishops to send the consecrated elements to one another, as a sign of intercommunion. This is mentioned, as an ancient usage, by St. Irenæus (in his letter to Victor), towards the end of the second century. Here we see the same purpose, which is explained by Pope Innocent, in the fourth century. 'The consecrated elements,' he says, 'were sent from the cathedral to the dependent churches of the city, in order that all might feel themselves bound together in one communion.' But what would have been the meaning of this, unless the elements had been supposed to gain some especial sanctity by consecration?"

Now, surely the Archdeacon is not ignorant that a feast upon a sacrifice was the common custom, not only of believers, whether Jews or Christians, but also of heathens, as a token at once of their union with the Deity, whom they worshipped, and of communion with each other. The term *κοινωνία*, "communion," which was applied as an ordinary designation of this sacrament, must, in addition to the former ideas of the early converts, whether Jews or heathen, have led them to look upon joint participation as the most satisfactory evidence of Christian brotherhood, as it was its surest seal. The *Agapæ* of the primitive Church had their origin in the same idea and intent, and were certainly derived from the same source. These were continued for many ages in the Church, and generally in connection with the Eucharistic celebration. The origin and mode of conducting them is thus abridged by Riddle from Siegel:—"The Greek word *Agape* (*ἀγάπη*), which signifies love or charity, is used in ecclesiastical antiquities to denote a certain feast, of which all members of the Church, of whatever rank or condition, partook together, intended to denote and cherish those dispositions of humility and brotherly affection which the Gospel prescribes to the disciples of Jesus. In the New Testament, the word occurs only once in this sense of *feast of charity*, or *love-feast*,—namely, in the Epistle of St. Jude, verse 12, and there it is found in the plural number; but the observance itself is alluded to in the sacred records, under other names, as *meat*, *tables* (Acts ii., 46; vi. 2). The word was retained by ecclesiastical writers, but not to the exclusion of other

significant appellations:—*e. g.*, συμπόσια, *banquets*; κοιναὶ τράπεζαι, *public tables*; κοιναὶ ἑστιάσεις, *public feasts*; δεῖπνα κοινά, *public suppers*. This use of the term Ἀγάπη is not found in the writings of any profane authors before the Christian era; but it occurs in the works of Plutarch and Celsus, who doubtless borrowed it from the Christians.

"It is certain that the feast of charity was celebrated in the earliest period of the Christian Church (see Acts ii., 46; vi., 2; 1 Cor. xi., 16—34). Some writers suppose that this custom had its remote origin in the practice of the heathen; while others regard it as derived from the Jewish synagogue. But it is, perhaps, still more probable that it originated simply in the circumstances of our Lord's last supper with His disciples; or that, at all events, it is to be attributed entirely to the genius of a religion which is eminently a bond of brotherly union and concord among its sincere professors.

"In the earliest accounts which have come down to us, we find that the bishop, or presbyter, presided at these feasts (Justin Martyr, Apolog. 2; see also 1 Cor., xii). It does not appear whether the food was dressed in the place appointed for the celebration of the feast, or was previously prepared by individual members of the Church at their own homes; but perhaps either of these plans was adopted indifferently, according to circumstances. Before eating, the guests washed their hands, and a public prayer was offered up. A portion of Scripture was then read, and the president proposed some questions upon it, which were answered by the persons present. After this, any accounts which had been received respecting the affairs of other churches were recited; for, at that time, such accounts were regularly transmitted from one community to another, by means of which all Christians became acquainted with the history and condition of the whole body, and were thus enabled to sympathize with, and in many cases to assist, each other. Letters from bishops and other eminent members of the Church, together with the acts of the martyrs, were also recited on this occasion; and hymns or

psalms were sung (Cyprian, *Ep. de Spectac.;* Tertull. *de Coron.* c. 3; Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v., c. 22). At the close of the feast, money was collected for the benefit of widows and orphans, the poor, prisoners, and persons who had suffered shipwreck. Before the meeting broke up, all the members of the Church embraced each other, in token of mutual brotherly love; and the whole ceremony was concluded with a philanthropic prayer. (Justin Mart. *Apol.* ii.; Origen *in Ep. ad Rom.* xvi., 16).*

It cannot be assumed, then, that the custom which at one time existed, of sending the consecrated elements to the *absent*, whether of home or foreign churches, was founded on the supposition "that the elements themselves conveyed some special gift." In fact, long after the custom referred to had been authoritatively abolished, because of abuses,—(and why should it have been *abolished*, if the elements conveyed some special gift?),—other means were used to express the same idea of intercommunion. There were, to be sure, always many modes in which the same thing was shewn;† but when a close copy of the prohibited trans-

* Riddle's Chris. Ant., pp. 728—730.

† "Where we find, that not only the present members were all communicants, but they that were absent had it sent to them by the hands of a deacon, to testify that, while they were absent upon any lawful occasion, they were still reputed to be in the communion of the Church. Thus, Justin Martyr says, [Justin. Apol. ii. p. 98. Vid. Justinian. Novel. 123. cap. 36. Aut sanctam eis communionem portandam], the same Eucharist, which was received by them that were present, was carried by the deacons to the absent. For as they prayed for those that were absent, upon a probable or reasonable cause, so they allowed them to communicate in the same sacrament also. Upon this account, as we have seen before [b. xv. c. 2. s. 5], the Eucharist at Rome, in the time of Melchiades, Siricius, and Innocent, was usually sent from the bishop's Church to the *tituli*, or lesser churches, for the presbyters ministering in those churches to communicate with him, and, as some think [Maurice of Diocesan Episcopacy, p. 39], for the whole congregations also. For they suppose, that at first there was but one altar in a city, and that at the mother Church, where the bishop ministered, and consecrated the Eucharist, and sent it thence to the lesser congregations. And so they understand even that passage in Justin Martyr. I rather think, the presbyters had the privilege to consecrate the Eucharist in their own churches; but, however, a portion of the Eucharist was for all that sent them by the bishop from his own Church, to testify that they were in communion with him: he did not send to the country churches, because the sacraments were not to be carried to places at too great a distance, as Innocent words it in his letter to Decentius. Yet, in case of testifying their communion with foreign bishops, they were wont to send it to far distant churches. As

action was made and regularly used, we see at once what was the idea which the same persons had in the interchange of the consecrated elements. If other means were thought to express the same thing, which were substituted for the sacred elements after their interchange was prohibited, it is evident that the primitive Christians did not imagine that any greater *gift* was bestowed in the one case than in the other, though the greater sanctity of the consecrated elements would naturally add a greater sanction to the transaction than any substitute could give.

It is to be feared that the causes which led to some other peculiar usages, were not so laudable or so innocent as the foregoing. The respect which ought to be given to the Eucharist was not given in the apostles' days by the Corinthian converts; but it is very apparent that excess in the other direction became common very early in the Church. The foolish reserve which the Christians adopted, and the "mystical" terms which they employed when referring to the Eucharist especially, gave the heathen a

Irenæus, in his Epistle to Pope Victor [Ap. Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 24], when he menaced the Asiatic Churches with excommunication for their different way of observing Easter, tells him his predecessors never thought of such rough proceedings against them; but, notwithstanding this difference, always sent them the Eucharist to testify their communion with them. Valesius [Vales. in locum.] and others observe the same in the Acts [Acta Lucien. ap. Metaphrast. 7. Jan.] of Lucian the martyr, and Paulinus's [Paulin. Ep. 1. ad Severum.] epistle to Severus. This was chiefly, if not solely, done at the Paschal festival, in token of their unity, love, and charity. But the council of Laodicea [Conc. Laodic. can. 13. Περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὰ ἅγια εἰς λόγον εὐλογιῶν κατὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ πάσχα εἰς ἑτέρας παροικίας διαπέμπεσθαι], for some inconveniences attending the practice, absolutely forbade it; ordering that the holy sacraments should not be sent from one diocese to another, under the notion of *eulogiæ*, or benedictions, at the Easter festival. Yet, in some places, the custom continued for several ages after. For Johannes Moschus [Mosch. Pratum Spiritual. cap. 29] speaks of the communion being sent from one monk to another at six miles' distance: not to mention again the custom of sending the Eucharist by Paulinus, and the bishops of Rome, from the mother Church to all the other churches throughout the city in every region. But where they left off this custom of sending the Eucharist, they introduced another way of testifying their mutual love and amity to one another, by certain symbols of bread, which they blessed and sanctified also in imitation of the Eucharist, but with a different benediction. And to these, also, they gave the names of *eulogiæ* and *panis benedictus* (consecrated bread), which the modern Greeks call ἀντίδωρα (vicarious gifts), because they were given in many cases instead of the Eucharist."

handle, and laid the foundation for many charges which were brought against them by their unscrupulous adversaries. Perhaps the very different estimate which was made of them by the heathen in Pliny's time, and subsequently, was, in some degree, due to the language and conduct of the Christians themselves. For when the governor of Bythinia wrote to Trajan respecting this "troublesome" sect, he had nothing to allege against them, as Tertullian well remarks, in his apology to Severus. "For," says he, "the second Pliny, while governor of a province, when some Christians had been condemned, some degraded, being nevertheless troubled by their very numbers, asked of Trajan (then emperor) what he should do for the future; alleging that, excepting their obstinacy in not sacrificing, he had discovered nothing else touching their religious mysteries, save meetings before day-break, to sing to Christ as God, *and to form a common bond of discipline:* forbidding murder, adultery, fraud, perjury, and other crimes."* Now, this clear account of a heathen contrasts strangely with the intimations contained in the passage of Tertullian, *ad uxorem*, to which reference is made in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," on the subject of the private partaking of the Eucharist. In that letter, having quoted the caution of our Lord, not to cast pearls before swine, he says, "*Your pearls* are the notes of your daily conversation. *The more you take care to hide them*, the more suspected wilt thou make them, and the more needful to guard against heathen (her husband's) curiosity. Wilt thou escape notice when thou signest thy bed, thy little body (*corpus culum*, the husband's term of endearment)? when with thy breath thou blowest away anything unclean? when thou risest even in the night to pray? and wilt thou not be thought to be working somewhat of sorcery? Will not thy husband know what thou tastest in secret before all food? and if he knoweth it to be bread, will he not believe it to be that which is reported? And will any man, not knowing the reason, simply bear with these things with-

* Pliny's Ep. x., 97.

out a groan? without a suspicious doubt whether it be bread *or a charm?* Some do bear with them, but that they may trample on, that they may mark such women, whose *secrets* they reserve for the danger which they believe will come."*

Now, in this passage, it is remarkable what use is made of secresy on all sides. Tertullian deems it necessary—the wife religiously observes—the husband misinterprets it. It was this secresy, joined with an exaggerated estimate of the sanctity or virtue of the consecrated elements, which led to the charges of magic and charms, so constantly alleged against the Christians in early ages. This practice of reservation and private communion (if the terms be not a contradiction), having originated, as we have seen, in the sending of the elements to the absent and sick members of a Church, and also to others more distant, as a bond of brotherhood, and a token of communion, was abolished at last, on account of the many abuses which grew out of it. It was a superstitious feeling which lay at the bottom of this practice, and not the idea that the elements were the veritable body and blood, soul and divinity, of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Mr. Wilberforce says, "all these circumstances imply that the elements themselves were supposed to gain a sanctity, which made them the means of communicating the gift, which was sought for in the Holy Eucharist; and, therefore, that the blessing was believed to be bound up with the thing itself, and not to depend merely upon the coincident action of the parties." This language is indefinite, and, therefore, ambiguous. There are few Christians who think other than that the elements gain a sanctity—relative sanctity—from the consecration, and are made "a means" of communicating what they signify to the worthy recipient; but that this should be made a basis for the belief of a substantial change in the bread and wine is certainly astonishing. With the idea that this change brings the true body of Christ into the elements, the "usages" are altogether at variance. For, however much

* Ad uxorem, ii., 5.

respect men paid, or virtue they attributed, to the reserved portion of the Eucharist, yet the mode in which they dealt with it shews plainly that they had not the transubstantiated idea of it. This is manifest enough, not only from the consideration of the usages *per se*, but also demonstrably so, when compared with the totally different ones of the modern Church of Rome.

Now, those usages to which I have referred, were such as the following:—In the case of Gregory Nazianzen's sister, Gorgonia, to which the Archdeacon makes reference, as proving reservation and private participation, we are told that she made a plaster, or salve, of the consecrated elements, with which she anointed her body, as a cure for her corporeal malady. Here, certainly, we have evidence of superstition, but none whatever of the impression which it is suggested must have prevailed from the former part of this transaction. A similar case is mentioned by St. Augustine, who tells us that, when a physician proposed to use mechanical means to open theeyelids of a boy, whose eyes were thought to be perfect, "his pious mother would not suffer it; but what the physician would have done with his lancet, she effected with a plaster made of the sacrament; the child, being then five years old or upwards, said that he remembered it very well."*

The practice of burying the Eucharist with the dead was also a custom savouring of superstition, and shewing that some idea of its acting as a charm was prevalent, but not that it was deemed what the Papists deem it now. In the "Life of St. Basil," attributed to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconia, we read that "St. Basil, dividing the bread into three parts, took one with great fear, and that he reserved the other to be buried with him; and that, having put the third parcel upon a golden pigeon, he waved it upon the altar, or, as it is said afterwards, upon the holy table."† A Council of Carthage, assembled in the year 419, condemned this practice in one of its canons, which is the eighteenth in the code of canons of the Church of Africa. "It hath been

* Aug. Oper. imperf. contr. Julian., l. iii, c. 164.

† Vita Basil, c. 8, in Vit. Pat., l. i.

resolved, not to give the Eucharist unto dead bodies; for it is written, 'Take and eat;' now dead bodies can neither take nor eat."* Gregory the First, in his dialogues, relates the following story of a youth that was a friar, and that having gone out of the monastery to see his parents, without the benediction, died the same day that he came home; and, after he had been buried, next day the body was found cast out of the grave; and, having been buried a second time, the same accident happened again: then the friars speedily went unto S. Bennet, and prayed him with tears to shew favour unto the deceased party, "unto whom, saith Gregory, the man of God, with his own hands gave the communion of the body of the Lord, saying, Go and lay this body of the Lord with reverence, upon his breast, and so bury him; which being done, the earth received and retained his body, and cast it out no more."†

In some churches, the practice was *to burn* the sacramental remains. This was the custom of the Church of Jerusalem, as Hesychius, a presbyter of that Church, testifies in his "Lectures on Leviticus." In other churches, as Evagrius tells us in his history, a different course was adopted. He says—"It was an ancient custom in the Church of Constantinople, that when several parcels of the immaculate body of Christ our God remained, young children were sent for from school, unto whom they were given to eat."‡ To obviate which not quite seemly proceeding, several decrees were made, that no more should be consecrated than could be consumed, if not in the ordinance, at least by the communicants immediately afterwards, before parting.§

Another custom which existed, wholly inconsistent with the idea of transubstantiation, was the mixing the ink, wherewith solemn documents were written, with some consecrated wine, as was done by Pope Theodore, in the seventh century, when he signed the condemnation and deposition of Pyrrhus, a Monotholite, as is

* Cod. can. Eccles. Afric. just. l. c. 18. T. 1. Concil. Gall. c. 12.
† Greg. l. Dial. l. 2.
‡ Evagr. Hist., l. iv., c. 35. § See Clement's Ep. 2. Conc. Toled. xvi., c. 6.

related by Cardinal Baronius. "Pyrrhus," says he, "having left Rome, and being arrived at Ravenna, returned like the dog unto his vomit; which, Pope Theodorus understanding, he assembled the whole Church, and went unto the sepulchre of the chief of the apostles, and, asking for the holy cup, he poured the quickening blood into the ink,* and so with his own hand signed the deposition of Pyrrhus, who had been excommunicated." So it was also done by the eighth Council of Constantinople, assembled against Photius, in the year 869. For the bishops subscribed the deposition of Photius, with pens dipped not in ink only, but in the blood of Christ itself.†

Now, we cannot help seeing that, although the usages adduced by the Archdeacon go to the length of shewing, that great and superstitious respect was generally paid to the sacramental emblems in the ancient Church, which all my own instances equally prove, they do not at all establish the point which he wishes them to make good, while mine establish quite the contrary. In fact, it is improbable in the highest degree,—that is, it is impossible, if the practice of adoration had existed in the primitive Church, in consequence of an idea of the actual presence of Christ's body and blood,—but that the thing would appear in the plainest possible manner. It would no more have been left to hints and deductions, than it is now left in the Church of Rome. In addition to this consideration, the actual existence of practices wholly inconsistent with the modern Romish idea, makes the conviction inevitable, that there are no grounds in antiquity for the peculiar doctrines of Trent, but that they are novel as well as unscriptural—as unknown to the early Churches as to the evangelists and apostles themselves.

The custom which also existed in some places, of not consecrating on certain days, as inauspicious, and of reserving, as possessing more virtue, that consecrated on a high festival, equally shew that

* Apud. Baron. an 648, sec. 15.

† In anteact. Synod. t. vi., Concil. p. 896. For other instances and authorities, see L'Arroque, bk. i. cap. 16.

the fallacy of the present Romish Church had no place in the ancient. For how could it be possibly imagined that transubstantiation was less effectually performed, or, being performed, less effectual in its operation, on one occasion than on another? If the change were always made, "the gift" must have been ever the same, and "the virtue" invariable. The preference of days for consecrating, and the supposed varying efficiency of the sacred gifts, are absolutely subversive of the Popish figment, unless we are prepared to assent to the monstrous doctrine, that the body and blood of Christ have more virtue in them one day than another, and that the supplies of spiritual food from the heavenly garner are properly distinguished as better and worse.

"But," says the Archdeacon,—

"A further proof is supplied by the manner in which Christ was asserted to communicate Himself, as a whole, in every portion of the consecrated elements. For though the Holy Eucharist was administered in all Churches under both kinds, until the twelfth century—and the contrary practice was forbidden by Gelasius, when the Manichæans, who thought the use of wine unlawful, refused to partake of it, yet both kinds were held to communicate one gift, which was supposed to be imparted perfectly through every portion of either element. It is obvious, then, that the intervention of the elements themselves, was looked to as the appointed means of conveying the blessing. The ancient notion was identical with that which was laid down by the Greek Church at the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 1672:*—'We believe that in

* We were promised "anti-Nicene" authorities, or such as did not "go lower than the eminent divines who were contemporary with the first four councils of the ancient Church," when we began the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist;" but we have been brought down now to less than two hundred years ago, for illustration, if not for authority. Let the reader say what is to be thought of this illustration or authority, whichever it be, when he has read the following extract from Dr. Covel's account of this so-called "council." Plenty of similar doings are to be found recorded in Mons. Claude's "Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist," bk. ii.:—"Mons. Arnauld had written a treatise *La Perpetuite*, &c.—'The Perpetuity of the Faith of the Catholic Church concerning the Eucharist,' designed chiefly, as I have been often told, to have brought over a marshal of France to the Church of Rome. The famous Mons. Claude wrote against him, and at last, among other points of controversy between them, this was insisted on as a grand question, whether the present Greek Church did own transubstantiation or not. Mons. Arnauld affirmed that it did—Mons. Claude as positively denied it. The Romish emissaries, who had been for a long time sowing this new

every portion, even to the minutest subdivision, of the bread and wine after they have been changed, are contained not any separate part of the body and blood of the Lord; but the body of Christ is always whole, and one in all its parts; and the Lord Jesus is present in His

doctrine up and down among the Greeks (as is above noted), were immediately set on work to see now what crop they might reap thereby, in order to support Mons. Arnauld's assertion. In this effort they did not apply themselves so much to ordinary priests, or others of a lower rank, as they aimed at the chief and leading men among them; having well known, and everywhere practised all along that saying, 'Smite the shepherds, and the sheep will be scattered;' if by any ways or means they could but prevent or secure the great one, the rest would not much trouble either themselves or them. The great men, however, were very wary and cautious at first, and gave but very cold or insignificant answers to either their private letters or personal demands; according to Nectarius's advice to Paisius (in an epistle which I have by me in MSS.), who bade him not give Friar Lazarus (who had solicited him for his opinion concerning the Eucharist) so much as the very Lord's Prayer in writing under his hand, for he and the rest of the emissaries came slyly and craftily to traduce and disturb our affairs; and he told him that the Pope himself, desiring such a confession, should not get it. Seeing, therefore, that no private man, by word of mouth, or letter, could do any good in prosecuting this affair, it was at last concluded that the Marquis de Nointel (then the King of France's ambassador at Constantinople), being a man of address and of great devotion, and now in so powerful a post, was the most proper man to undertake and effect the weighty matter. His first attempt was upon Parthenius, the patriarch of Constantinople, in June and July, 1671, but could not prevail. He had at the same time, it is said, been treating with Dositheus, patriarch of Jerusalem, from whom he received the declaration, called the synod of Bethlehem or Jerusalem. It is most evident that the Latins (the Jesuits and others swarming about the French court at Galata) furnished the main materials of this specious fabric; and it is possible enough that Dositheus might be prevailed with, and did undertake to reduce and model them as we now have them. For, first, the French ambassador, in his certificate, says thus expressly:—'Dositheus, the present patriarch of Jerusalem, coming to Constantinople, has declared unto us that he had fully satisfied that which we had desired of him, following the advices which he had received by our letters about it.' It is plain, then, that the French ambassador put him upon this design; and what those advices were, I think no man can be so stupid as not to imagine. They were, without all doubt, that the Greeks should particularly declare, that all the points, especially that of transubstantiation, which were asserted by Mons. Arnauld, in his controversy between him and Mons. Claude, were orthodox, or according to the doctrine of the Greek Church; and, from what shall here follow, I cannot but think that these points were specified, and many of them set down in words at length by the Latins which were about the ambassador, and sent to Dositheus by his order; for the ambassador did not understand Greek himself, and, therefore, could not treat with the patriarch but by interpreters. From whom but from the French had Dositheus these notices of the heretical books and writings of Mons. Claude, and that he was a Calvinist minister at Charenton? To my knowledge Dositheus, with whom I conversed very frequently, knew then neither Latin nor French. Whence, then, came he by all the school divinity and Latin notions which we meet withal in his decrees?"—Covel's Account of the Greek Church, pp. 136, 146.

substance, that is, with His soul and divinity, as perfect God and perfect man.' "—*Doct. of H. Euch.*, pp. 70, 71.

It is really amusing, while melancholy, to witness the infatuation which can make a man pen such a sentence as the one just quoted. With the most perfect perception of the fact, that, in accordance with the terms of institution, the Eucharist was administered in all Churches, both of the East and West, till the twelfth century, *in both kinds*, with the exception of the Manichæans, and with an emphatic condemnation of the contrary practice by Pope Gelasius on his lips, Mr. Wilberforce actually begins and ends his sentence with a virtual contradiction of the facts which he states, and an approval of the practice which he acknowledges has been on all hands condemned. The doctrine taught in the extracts from the Ambrosian liturgy, and from Cæsarius, is by no means different from Protestant doctrine, which is, that the efficiency of Eucharistic communion does not at all depend upon the *quantity* of the elements partaken of, which can only be true if that which is received be spiritual grace and effective virtue. For if the substance of Christ's even-glorified body be there, it must occupy space, or it is no body. A body must have parts and extension, or it is not one according to our ideas of a body; and if such be the case, the more of the elements are received, the more of that which they convey is received under them. To argue upon the properties of *glorified* bodies,* of which we know nothing at all, in order to bolster up

* Perhaps a more hopeless case of jumble, "confusion worse confounded," could hardly be found than the following lucid summary of his antecedent discoveries by the Archdeacon. Here are his own words:—"The brief sketch which has been given, shows the various modes of expression which were employed in the early Church respecting the Holy Eucharist, and what were the several circumstances which gave their impress to its phraseology. And it is obvious that, if it were made a question, in what *manner* our Lord's presence in the Holy Eucharist was supposed to be brought about, and still more if it were requisite to explain this process, in terms which all parties in the ancient Church would have been prepared to accept, the inquiry would involve considerable difficulty. It would be necessary to find some mode of adjustment between the tendency of the eastern school, as it has been called, on one side, and that of the opponents of Eutychianism on the other. The former tendency went so far, in some instances, as to imply that the outward part retained no real existence at

what we do know to be absurdities, manifests more of subtilty than honesty in him who employs it, and more of credulity than wisdom in those who are influenced thereby. There is no deduction of reason but may be abandoned, no suggestion of common sense but may be renounced, if the possibilities in a future state, or the baseless dreams of a deluded imagination, be taken as a guide in this matter-of-fact world of ours.

But we are told,—

"It was a consequence of this doctrine, that when circumstances debarred men from the regular reception of the elements in both kinds, they were yet believed to receive the whole blessing through that medium which remained to them. The mention of bread only, when the Holy Eucharist was received in private houses, leads to the conclusion that

all: the latter led to language which might be represented to mean that it was wholly unaltered. The more scientific statements of the school of St. Augustine did not harmonize exactly with either. And, consequently, the theory subsequently maintained by Aquinas, that the *substance* of our Lord's body and blood supersedes that of the bread and wine, while, so far as the senses go, the latter remain wholly unaltered, was an explanation of the mode in which our Lord's presence is brought about, which did not exactly accord with the statements of any early party." Here, then, we have, I know not how many, different "modes of expression,"—that is, different ideas,—on the Eucharist:— 1. That of the eastern school, "which went so far, in some instances, as to imply that the outward part retained no real existence at all" (which we might have imagined of the fanciful children of the Orient, and their poetic and flowery language). 2. That of the Eutychian school, which adopted "language, which might be represented to mean that it was wholly unaltered" (which would not be far from the truth). 3. That "of the school of St. Augustine, which did not harmonize exactly with either." 4. That "subsequently maintained by Aquinas . . . which did not exactly accord with the statements of any early party." 5. Then comes the Wilberforcean school, which sometimes "combines," "unites," the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti* "into one whole," sometimes transubstantiates *that* into *this;* defining Christ's presence as "a manifold," "a dynamic," presence. But this is not all; we must add a sixth, if not a seventh school; for "It has been disputed whether the system of Aquinas really implies that the elements retain the power of nourishment; and therefore, whether the elements, considered as objects of sense, can still be said to be present. For the process by which the digestive organs supply the body with nourishment, is one of which the senses can take note. Now Aristotle, and the schoolmen after him, taught that food nourishes through the transference of its *substance* to the party nourished. And Aquinas supposes the substance to be the thing changed. But then Aquinas and his followers maintained, first, that Christ's body does not nourish our bodies in the Holy Eucharist. ["Corpus Christi est cibus mentis, non ventris; animæ non corporis."—Opusc. lix., 6, and vide Summa, iii., 77, 6. Catechis. Trident Pars. ii., De Euch. Sac. 50.] Secondly, that our bodies are nourished by the sensible elements. [Vide Suarez de Sacram. Disp. lvii., 3. Cat. Trid. ib. 39.] And for this Aquinas

it was partaken in that kind alone. The story of Serapion, as related by Eusebius, shows that this was supposed sufficient in the case of the sick, and from a circumstance recorded by St. Cyprian, we learn that infants were communicated under the other kind only."

These circumstances appear to me to be, not a consequence of a belief in transubstantiation, or of "whole Christ," being contained in each particle of either element, but from the idea either that the sacrament acted as a charm, or else it was the result of necessity. This is the opinion of Neander, who is referred to by Mr. Wilberforce in a note, as acknowledging the existence of this half communion in private houses. He says:

"In those cases, however, where the custom of daily communion still prevailed: but divine service was held, and the sacramental supper consecrated, only one or twice on Sunday and Friday, or, at most, but four times a week, on Sunday, Saturday, Wednesday, and Friday, no other course remained for those who were desirous of having the body of the Lord for their daily nourishment, except to take home with them a portion of the consecrated bread—for a superstitious dread prevented them from taking with them the wine, which might be so easily spilled—and to reserve it for future use, so that now they might every day, before engaging in any worldly employment, participate of the sacrament, and consecrate and strengthen themselves by communion with the Lord. In voyages by sea, also, Christians were in the habit of

accounted by saying that, after consecration, the *bulk* [quantitas] took the place of the *substance*, or, in other words, that when the substance was said to be changed, the term *substance* was not to be understood in so wide a sense as that in which it was employed by Aristotle. It is thus stated by De Marca: "The *substance* was supposed to exist as something separate from the *bulk* of the bread, so that this *bulk* might exist naturally by itself, without any new miracle, whatever Aristotle may say."—[Traité de l'Eucharistie, works, vol. v. p. 125.] Thus, as I had before occasion to remark, we have resuscitated the science as well as the theology of the middle ages. "Bulk" nourishes after the *substance* has been removed! I do not see why shape (figura) and colour (color) should not have their part in the operation as well as "bulk." There is bulk in a brick or a bundle of straw; why should not either of these nourish as well as a loaf of bread, if bulk only does it? Perhaps, however, it is so. The *bulk* of what we eat makes us *stout;* its colour decides our complexion—so that he who feeds on red wheat will be ruddy, on white, pale; and we are tall or short according as our food was that or this. What Buffon (I think) says of the stag's horns being the developments of the branches upon which it fed, is, perhaps, the sober deduction of philosophic truth! Such is the rubbish for which we are asked to renounce the use of reason and of revelation together. God forbid!

taking with them a portion of the consecrated bread, so as to have it in their power to partake of the sacrament by the way.* This abuse, so contradictory to the original design of the Holy Supper, whereby it was converted into a sort of amulet, was the occasion, too, of bringing about the first deviation from the original form of institution; for Christians were now satisfied when they partook of the consecrated bread without the cup."

The case of Serapion was one of necessity rather than of superstition, on the part both of himself and of the priest concerned; though so much cannot be said of Eusebius, who relates the story. It is thus given by the historian:

"Dionysius, in his letter to Fabius, by way of reflection upon the uncharitable determination of Novatus, tells a story of Serapion, an old man, that had apostatised, and done sacrifice; and, therefore, his absolution had been from time to time deferred. This poor, unhappy wretch, falling into a dangerous illness, lost his speech and his senses for four days together; when, a little recovering both, he sent in all haste for a presbyter. The presbyter was himself sick in bed, and unable to visit him, but he sent him a consecrated viaticum, So soon as his child (that had been the messenger), was approaching, before he had yet set eyes on him, he recovered his speech again, which in the interim had failed; and directed him, since the presbyter could not come in person, to give him what he had ordered, and release him. Accordingly he received it, and immediately expired."

This story of Serapion, and that of the child† referred to by

* See Ambros. oratio funebris de obitu fratris Satyri. This notion of a magical virtue residing in the bread, is illustrated by an example which Ambrose here relates in the case of his own brother. The latter, at some period before he had received baptism, being on board a ship which ran ashore, and was wrecked, obtained from some of his fellow-voyagers who had been baptized, a portion of the consecrated bread, which they carried with them. This he bound round his neck, and then confidently threw himself into the sea. He was the first to get to the land, and, of course, ascribed his deliverance to the power of this charm.

† It is melancholy to see on what vicious foundations such men as the Archdeacon build their faith. Leaving the Bible, which they feel will not support them, they run off to the Fathers, and catch at aught which can be twisted into a support of their system. I leave the reader to say what is to be thought of Cyprian for writing the following, which is the authority referred to:—"Listen to an event that took place in my own presence, and on my own testimony. Some parents who made their escape, in the thoughtlessness of terror left behind them at nurse an infant daughter, whom the nurse, finding in her hands, gave over to the magistrates. Unable, through its

Mr. Wilberforce, are good examples of the superstitious views which were held in the second and third centuries on the subject of the holy Eucharist. It was not so much as vehicles of spiritual good, as charms for the averting of temporal evils, that the reserved elements were sought and used; and it is to be feared that the same erroneous impression accompanied the communicants to the altar in the Church. What was the exact idea connected with the word *viaticum* by the ancients, it may not be quite easy satisfactorily to educe; but if it were that of the modern Church of Rome, it was, that the elements acted as a charm for the soul in its exit from earth, as they had been deemed before in the delivery of the body from temporal evils.

Here, again, in the midst of abuses which it grieves the mind to see, and growing out of superstitious practices and unwarranted expectations regarding the Holy Supper, are many evidences that

tender years, to eat flesh, they gave it, before an idol to which the crowd assembled, bread mingled with some wine, which, however, was remains of that which had been used in the soul-slaughter of perishing Christians. The mother afterwards got back her child; but the infant was as unable to express and make known the act that had been committed, as she had before been to understand or to prevent it. Through ignorance, therefore, it arose, that, when we were sacrificing, the mother brought it in with her. The child, however, mixed with the holy congregation, could not bear our prayers and worship: it was at one moment convulsed with weeping, then became tossed like a wave by throbs of feeling; and the babe's soul, while yet in the tender days, confessed a consciousness of what had happened with what signs it could, as if forced to do so by a torturer. When, however, after the solemnities were complete, the deacon began to offer the cup to those who were there, and, in the course of their receiving, its turn came, the little child turned its face away, under the instinct of God's majesty, compressed its lips in resistance, and refused the cup. The deacon, however, persevered, and forced upon her, against her will, of the sacrament of the cup. There followed a sobbing and vomiting. The Eucharist was not able to remain in a body and mouth that had been polluted. The draught which had been consecrated in the blood of the Lord, made its way from a body which had been desecrated. So great is the power of the Lord, so great the majesty. The secrets of the darkness are laid open under His light, and God's priest could not be deceived in crimes, however hidden. Thus much concerning an infant, which had not the age to make known a crime which was committed on her by the act of others."—(De Lapsis, 16). Either Cyprian was a very weak, or a very wicked man. I do not think that he was wicked, and *invented* the story; so I think he was a very weak one, to make the use he has of it. It would seem as if the poor child was seized with convulsions; and this was interpreted by the swarthy bishop of Carthage into some supernatural dread or magical influence of the consecrated elements. Those who wish to see more of the same sort, may consult Cyprian *in loco*.

the opinions of the ancients were not those of the present Church of Rome. Thus, in the case of Serapion, is it at all likely that, if the sick priest had had the same opinion of the Eucharist as is now insisted upon in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," he would have sent it by the hands of a boy? Indeed it is thought (apparently very correctly) by most, that, had it not been for the doctrine of transubstantiation, we should still have had infant communion and private reservations, &c.; and that these unwarranted practices were all done away by the introduction of the more unwarranted doctrine.

In this matter, then, the different conduct of the ancient Church points to a corresponding difference in faith. In each case the practice seems suitable to the belief held, as does also that of Protestants now-a-days, which differs in some important respects from both.

In short, the whole language and conduct of the early Church, though running to excess in the direction of mysticism and superstition, in regard to the Eucharist, is still very far short of what it ought to have been, had their belief been that of Trent. In such comparatively indifferent matters as receiving the sacred elements *fasting*, with the hands crossed, or in vessels of gold, or other precious material,* we may see much of superstition and of exaggerated estimate respecting the consecrated elements; yet all these do not sanction the *adoration* which is now demanded; and in this opinion the Church of Rome herself joins. For on what other ground is it that she has abolished the ancient customs, and introduced others which she deems necessary to indicate the respect due to the Deity present? In short, the Church of Rome is as much condemned by what she has rejected of the old Eucharistic ceremonies, as by what she has substituted for them. She has been forced to change the ancient practice, because she has changed the ancient faith. Not antagonistic to a *true* view, though somewhat inconsistent with a *sober* one, were the language

* This practice was condemned by Conc. Trull., can. 101.

and conduct of Cyril and Cyprian, Ambrose and Chrysostom, sometimes Augustine; but the teaching of the Romish communion on the subject before us, both as to faith and practice, is, while consistent with itself, inconsistent with all beside. A Church which professes a creed, and exhibits a practice, *sui generis*, unlike those of all others, is a church which can lay no claim to the title of the One True, Catholic, Apostolic.

There is one impression which has been painfully, but strongly, forced upon me in connection with the Archdeacon's volume; and it is, that it is *essentially dishonest*. That any man should change his opinions, we have no right to object to, nor, perhaps, even to wonder at; but we have a right to expect, in connection with such a change, a fair statement of the grounds upon which it has taken place, and an upright course of conduct dependent upon it. Now, I think we have had neither in this case. I shall not allude further here to the retention of his preferments by Mr. Wilberforce, long after he had embraced, and openly taught, the most monstrous of Rome's heresies. But, to remark upon his book, is within my province. Now, I find evidences of this dishonesty, not in one thing only, but in several. 1. I find quotations garbled *with an intent*, for intention cannot be doubted when the end is apparent. Now, this is done when, in quoting St. Augustine's "Commentary on the Thirty-third Psalm," he writes thus:

"Who is carried," says St. Austin, "in his own hands? In the hands of others a man can be carried, but not in his own. How this could be understood literally of David, we do not find: but how it can be understood of Christ, we do find. For Christ was carried in His own hands, commending His own body He said, this is my body. For He bore that body in His own hands."

Now, in the last clause of this quotation, the words *quodam modo* are kept out altogether, which are most essential to the right understanding of the passage. As it is given in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," the most literal interpretation of our Lord having carried Himself in His own hands, is conveyed

to the reader from St. Augustine; but, when he says "in a certain manner" it is true, we at once see his meaning. The Archdeacon wished the passage to be understood *literally*, and so he did not hesitate to omit such words as were inconsistent with the impression which he wished to convey.

Another instance of the same dishonesty is in connection with the same Augustine. Mr. Wilberforce writes as follows:

"'If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.' 'How should fleshly people understand this, in that He calls bread by the name of flesh? That is called flesh, which the flesh cannot receive; and the reason why the flesh cannot receive it, is because it is called flesh. For they were horrified at this; they thought it a hard saying; they supposed it impossible. The faithful know what is meant by the body of Christ, if so be that to Christ's body they neglect not to pertain.' Whereas the Jews, he goes on to say, were ignorant 'how He was to be eaten, and what was to be the manner of eating that bread.'"

Now, what would any one suppose was intended by Augustine by the words, "The faithful know what is meant by the body of Christ, if so be that to Christ's body they neglect not to pertain?" especially when connected with the words following as quoted, about *eating Christ* and *eating bread*? Is it not every one's impression, on reading the passage, that the "body of Christ" refers to "the inward part or thing signified" in the Eucharist, and the manner of pertaining to it, of which the Jews were ignorant, sacramental participation? Yet, neither of these ideas is Augustine's. "The body of Christ," to which this Father speaks of pertaining, is *the visible Church*, and "the manner of eating," which the Jews understood not, was *being one with Christ*. "The faithful know the body of Christ, if they neglect not to be the body of Christ." "Let them become the body of Christ, if they wish to live by the Spirit of Christ. . . . Then wouldst thou also live by the Spirit of Christ? Be thou in the body of Christ. For doth my body live by Thy Spirit? Mine liveth by my Spirit, and thine by thine. The body of Christ cannot live but by the Spirit of

Christ." It is evident enough what Augustine means by "the body of Christ," though it is not at all what the Archdeacon insinuates by the quotation above, which is brought to prove "the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, shewn by the sixth chapter of St. John." So also as regards the mode of "eating" Christ's flesh, &c. "In the Eucharist" is the *insinuation* of the whole passage, and of the heading of the chapter. St. Augustine's explanation is, "This, then, it is to eat that meat, and drink that drink: to dwell in Christ and to have Christ dwelling in us." In fact, there is no countenance whatever in St. Augustine's "Commentary upon the Sixth Chapter of John," for the Popish figment of transubstantiation. I have given *entire*, in an appendix,* that part of St. Augustine's commentary on this chapter which has reference to the verses (47—63) respecting which the controversy is.

2. We have evidence of the same unfairness in the way in which our English divines are quoted. Some of the best of our writers, as Overall, Cosin, Hooker, and Taylor, are again and again quoted to sustain points to which it is well known they were opposed, and which the very works quoted condemn. Now, is it honest to extract a few words, or a paragraph, from a writer which necessarily misrepresents his sentiments, and makes him speak a language which he has not adopted, and support doctrines which he has specifically repudiated? Yet this has been done, as I shall shew, when I come to consider the views of our own Church and her writers on the subject of the Eucharist.

3. The authoritative declarations and protests of the Church of England, are explained away by verbal quibbles, or jesuitical reasonings. Thus, by making the Church of England mean *accidents* by *substance*, while the Church of Rome means what Aristotle meant by it, and what every one who understands the meaning of the word must understand by it, the difference between the Churches is made "verbal rather than real—in language, not

* See Appendix II.

in thought." So, also, the strong condemnation of the article of the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, as defined by the Council of Trent, is softened down to "The Council of Trent is *not accepted* by English churchmen; they *withhold their assent* from their account of the *manner* in which our Lord's presence is brought about in the Holy Eucharist." While special jesuitical pleading has attempted to make the rubric at the end of the communion service (which is as plainly condemnatory of the worship of the host as words can be) quite permissive of the practice, as it only does not go on to say, which it might have done, that "the supernatural presence of Christ's body and blood are bestowed in the Holy Eucharist."

4. The whole book is based upon one giant deception—viz., all the quotations from the Fathers are produced as though for the first time, and as if no reply to, or examination of, them had ever been made. Now, can any man honestly ignore the whole controversial theology of the Church of England? There is scarcely a passage in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist" but has been answered, and some of them many, many times, by our Protestant divines. To bring forward evidence which has been before rebutted, is the part of one who wishes for victory, not for truth. And, should the plan succeed, it is only obtaining credit under false pretences. It is disagreeable to be forced to such a conclusion as this, with respect to one of whom we once thought so highly; but there is no withstanding the effect of instances numerous and strong, coming upon us, as they do, from all sides and on every subject.

I have thus followed the tortuous windings of the quondam Archdeacon through the greater part of his erratic course. Such points as are still left untouched will come into the second part of this volume. I was anxious, as far as possible, to keep distinct the investigation of the Archdeacon's error, from the statement of the opposing truth. This has not been absolutely effected—perhaps it was scarcely possible. This is especially the case in the consideration of the contents of the ancient liturgies, and the

teaching of the early Fathers. In refuting the error, insinuated as contained in the former, and attempted to be proved from the latter, I have shewn what was really contained in the one and taught by the other. Over this ground, therefore, I shall not attempt to tread a second time.

The points hitherto controverted against Mr. Wilberforce have been, that the Bible alone is that to which Protestants can defer as authority, while they pay all due deference to the opinions of the wise and good of all ages. It has been proved, from incontestible evidence, that the consecration prayer in the Holy Eucharist was not, in the early Church, considered to work more effectually than similar prayers used on other occasions, nor in a different manner: and that, consequently, there is no essential difference between the two sacraments of baptism and the Holy Supper. I have shewn that the Fathers did not believe in a *corporeal* presence of Christ, in connection with the elements, in *any manner*; and that, therefore, they did not believe that His body and blood were to be worshipped or were offered in them. To these views we have found the ancient liturgies, and the writings of the Fathers, correspond. So that, in all the main points of his recently-adopted creed, the Archdeacon is without that support which he most values and ostentatiously claims.

I shall now proceed to consider the *true* Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as it is revealed to us in the scriptures, and confirmed by the teaching of all churches independent of modern Rome.

END OF BOOK I.

BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE USE OF MATERIAL SYMBOLS IN RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

It is interesting to the thoughtful mind to notice the care manifested by the Great Ruler of all things to bring His creatures into close acquaintance with Himself; and equally consolatory is it to the true Christian to feel that his heavenly Father has adopted likely means to maintain a connection with his erring creatures. "He knoweth our frame, and remembereth that we are but dust," is not more true or plainly seen in the pardon of sins, or the compassionate oblivion of infirmities, than in the suitable provisions which has been made to prevent the former and remove the latter. The evil, it is true, is seated in the soul, and to the soul the remedy must be applied. But as faith is necessary for practice, and evidence for faith, so we have mercifully provided for our senses certain representations of the unseen spiritualities with which is our chief concern, and, at the same time, "means whereby we receive the same, and pledges to assure us thereof." This is the use of all external symbols in religious worship, and we will briefly consider their nature and their use.

It is not to be supposed that we can ever arrive at any *certain* conclusion, as to the connection of the end with the means, in any religious ordinances. In all matters of such sort, far more blessed is he who can act because it is commanded, leaving the result to God, than he who will not believe till he has enquired, and pushes his enquiries till he thinks he understands all. Such an one has his faith suspended upon his investigations, instead of upon God's revelation and promises; and the no uncommon result of such a state of mind as this, is eternal instability

and the dissatisfaction of doubts, if not at length confirmed scepticism.

But if evils lie in the way of enquiry, and at last a gulph too broad to be overpassed, and too deep and dark to be scanned, there is much of evil on the other side in unenquiring ignorance and uninformed belief. Enlightened conviction is the most satisfactory basis for faith, both as regards the comfort of the possessor, and the stability of his principles.

There have ever been some differences of opinion, amongst even the wise and good, as to the value and importance to be attached to the use of symbols. It is hardly to be expected that, wherever we find the use of them recorded in God's word, it should be without effect, or without producing the *full* effect intended. But this is by no means to be assumed as the invariable result when used by inferior hands. In the case of divine interposition, the subject is always a *fit* one; or the blessing would not be bestowed, nor the external symbol, which is only an outward and visible sign of the boon, whether temporal or spiritual, be used. It is not wise, therefore, to argue from scriptural precedent in this matter, if such exists, to the same result in all cases whatsoever.

Now, while there is no lack of instances* in the Old and New Testament, wherein the medium of a sensible object is made use of; yet we can, perhaps, find no one in which there was any virtue in the symbol, or medium which would *a priori*, have suggested its use as appropriate; *i.e.*, there was nothing of virtue or power manifestly, or even presumptively, inherent in the visible instrument itself. Thus, it would appear that that which brought death into the world and all our woe, — viz., the eating of a fruit,

* I quite agree with Alexander Knox (from whom the substance of much of this chapter has been taken), when he says, "With respect to the Old Testament, I believe it may be asserted, that wherever a divine benefit, or blessing, whether to individuals, or to the whole people, was of such a nature as suitably to admit the intervention of a sensible instrument or medium,—something bearing that character in itself, perhaps, of the humblest nature, was almost uniformly employed. To particularise the various instances would be to transcribe a large portion of the sacred history."—Knox's "Doctrine of the Sacraments."

would have been the means of securing immortality, or of perpetuating it, if man's destiny had been of a happier cast; and the whole scheme of Judaism, as has been before remarked, was one of pictorial representation and of material media. The following extract, from the author above referred to, will give us, in as few words as well may be, a general view of the whole case:—"When, in the great progressive scheme of divine beneficence, Moses was commissioned to work miracles, he was not directed to perform them merely by a word. The shepherd's rod, which, at the moment of the divine call, he had in his hand, was from thence to be, not only the ensign, but the instrument of the power with which he was endued. 'Thou shalt take this rod,' said Jehovah, 'in thy hand, wherewith thou shalt do signs.' We accordingly find it afterward denominated *the rod of God;* and the numerous instances in which it was used, are so many exemplifications of Omnipotence acting through a material medium. There was a profound fitness in this mode of proceeding, else it would not have been adopted. It obviously gave a palpability to the divine interposition, which accommodated it, with peculiar aptitude, to the complex nature of man; while the simplicity of the means evinced the unseen agency by which the effect was accomplished.

"We may also observe, that not only where miraculous acts were to be performed, but even where settled purposes were to be notified, and habitual impressions produced, sensible expedients were equally employed Thus, to give sustenance, through the bodily senses, to the faith and devotion of the heart, the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, accompanied the children of Israel through the wilderness; and thus, when that miraculous token of the divine presence ceased to appear, the ark of the covenant, to which it had been used to attach itself, and which was thereby sealed as the perpetual symbol of God's special residence, became the point of inexpressible attraction to every true Israelite, as the place where God was infallibly to be found, and from whence mercy and goodness were sure to flow forth upon every faithful worshipper.

"The depth of this feeling might be illustrated by numerous examples. The care which God was pleased to take for its confirmation and continuance, at the consecration of Solomon's temple, by the reappearance of the same divine cloud attaching itself to the same ark, in proof that the same presence would reside in the new mansion, unspeakably evinced the value of such a support to faith, and such an excitement to devotion. Its actual influence on minds the most capable of appreciating it, is manifested in the case of Daniel; who so venerated and loved even the desolated spot which had been thus distinguished, that, in defiance of the king of Babylon's edict, he persevered in praying, as he had been wont, three times a day, 'his window being open, in his chamber, toward Jerusalem.'

"It will hardly be said, that the eyes of pious Israelites were directed to the ark, as the pledge and symbol of providential, rather than of strictly spiritual blessings. An expectation of these latter is continually expressed in the devotional language of the Old Testament; and it is everywhere evident that, in the inmost concerns of the heart, access to God was facilitated, reliance on God strengthened, and fixedness and concentration of mind secured and heightened, by the settled assurance of his specially-present Majesty.

"But it particularly pertains to the main question to remark, that amongst extraordinary effects produced in the Old Testament times, through material instruments, those of a strictly mental and spiritual nature are not wholly wanting. One instance, at least, of this kind is found in the impression on the mind of Elisha, through the touch of Elijah's mantle. Elijah had been directed to appoint Elisha his successor in the prophetic office. It may, therefore, be concluded, that the general dispositions of the latter fitted him for such a distinction; but he himself seems, at the moment, to have had no apprehension of what awaited him, as he was busily occupied in agricultural labour; but as soon as Elijah cast his mantle upon him, he is drawn as if by irresistible attraction, and only wishes to have time for bidding his father's house

farewell. The prophet, probably, had been led to throw his mantle by a special impulse, and scarcely foresaw the fulness of the result; for he answers, as if in some surprise, 'Go back again, for what have I done unto thee?' But it is remarkable that that very mantle becomes again the pledge and symbol of divine blessing to Elisha. He had asked that a double portion of his master's spirit should rest upon him; and the fall of Elijah's mantle, while the prophet himself was carried up to heaven, appears to have been regarded by Elisha, as notifying the success of his petition. In addition to what he himself had felt, he had seen Elijah divide the waters of Jordan, by smiting them with that very mantle; and as if to satisfy himself, that, in possessing the visible pledge, he possessed also the mysterious power, we see him smiting the same waters with the same mantle, with the solemn and successful appeal,—'Where is the Lord God of Elijah?'"*

And it is not alone to the dispensation of types and shadows that we have to look for this employment of a visible medium, by which the Divine Being sees fit to communicate, whether temporal or spiritual blessings. Similar means are used for both purposes in the transactions recorded in the New Testament, and equally successful in effects upon the body and the mind. Our author well continues:—"It was right, and perhaps necessary, that when the word was made flesh, and tabernacled among men, He should manifest His divine prerogative, of simply commanding nature, and being instantly obeyed. He, accordingly, on some occasions, merely spoke, and the effect immediately followed. Thus, He healed the centurion's servant, and the nobleman's son, who was sick at Capernaum. Thus, He stilled the tempest; and thus, also, He raised Lazarus from the tomb. But, ordinarily, He was pleased to act otherwise. He made use of some visible sign; and often transmitted the divine virtue, which dwelt in Him, through a material medium. He laid His hands on those who applied; or He permitted them to touch 'the hem of His garment, and as

* Knox's Doct. Sac. pp. 112—116.

many as touched Him were made perfectly whole.' Once He touched the tongue of a dumb man with His spittle. At another time He made clay by spitting on the ground, and put it on the eyes of a blind man, whom He sent (for the obvious purpose of notoriety) to wash it off in the pool of Siloam.

"Nor was it only where corporeal blessings were conveyed, that our Lord was pleased to use a visible sign. When children were brought to Him, not to be healed, but simply to receive His divine benediction, we read that He laid His hands upon them. And in that most signal instance, when, after His resurrection, He solemnly established His apostles in their exalted office, we are told, that 'He breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.'

"With reference to the particular subject under consideration, this last instance appears worthy of peculiar attention. The period of types and shadows was now clearly over, and the dispensation of 'grace and truth' had substantially begun. We may humbly conclude, therefore, that our Lord would do nothing at this time, which was not strictly congenial with all that was to follow. Yet at this moment of immutable precedent, He employs the same method of impressive accommodation to man's animal nature. In an instance the most important and vital, He communicates inward and spiritual grace, through an outward sign and a corporeal medium. His breath, as man, is made the vehicle of that Spirit, which, even as man, He had possessed without measure. It was the last and best blessing which His apostles were to receive from His bodily presence: and may be justly regarded as their first strict and proper animation with the inward and spiritual life; the first fulfilment of that promise, so lately made to them respecting the divine Paraclete, 'He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.' Here, therefore (it would seem), no less really than on the day of Pentecost, the words of His forerunner were verified, 'He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost.' On that day they received new powers: the fire which our Lord came to send upon the earth, was then *visibly* kindled:

but it was at that former time, when our Lord 'breathed upon them,' and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' that they really became *new creatures:* for how else shall we account for those clearer apprehensons of the new dispensation, which their choice of a successor to Judas, and their deep and unremitting intensity in prayer, prove them to have possessed, previously to their last signal endowment 'with power from on high?'

"I have enlarged on that remarkable act of our Redeemer, in His final intercourse with His apostles on earth, not merely because it may be thought in the highest degree pertinent to my present subject, but because its powerful influence, as manifested in so immediate a change of character, has, as far as I know, been hitherto not sufficiently adverted to.

"That the apostles, from this and other divine evidences, were, in their own minds, impressed with the suitable transmission of inward and spiritual blessings, through outward and visible signs, appears from their own subsequent practice. As their Divine Master, in breathing on them, had made them partakers of that Spirit which was in Him; so, when it became their part, as His ministers, to communicate, in measure, the same heavenly gift to others, they conferred this blessing by the imposition of their hands; and it is expressly testified, that 'through the laying on of the apostles' hands, the Holy Ghost was given.'

"It is remarkable, that this practice of the apostles is stated, without any explanatory observation; obviously, because such a proceeding, however wonderful in itself, was in such complete accordance with all of a like nature which had been done formerly, that there was no more room, before-hand, for questioning its fitness, than there was possibility, afterward, of disputing its efficacy."*

From these examples, then, and from the consideration of their suitability to the nature of man, we might, perhaps, be led even to expect some prescribed employment of visible media, in con-

* Knox's Doct. Sac. pp. 116—120.

nection with the impartation of spiritual blessings in the economy of grace. At all events, we cannot for a moment wonder at their appointment, and especially when we find those prescribed so extremely suitable in themselves to represent the agent and operation to which they respectively refer. I have above shewn at length that the water in baptism represents the Holy Spirit, and that the effect of that corporeal element on the body, is beautifully typical of the Spirit's operation on the soul. Similarly, the elements in the Eucharist are appropriate representations of the inward part of that sacrament, and the effect of the one have their exact counterpart, *mutatis mutandis*, in the effect of the other. The employment of media is, therefore, in the Christian system, perfectly analogous with the Creator's dealings under other dispensations; and in their relationship to man, in his external organization and spiritual being, these media are commemorative and didactic; they prevent the lapsing from the mind of truths of mighty import, and teach the need of invisible operations on the soul analogous to those on the body. The next question is, how far are they efficient?

Leaving out of consideration, for the present, the question as to whether or not our blessed Lord made any reference to the Eucharist in His discourse in John vi. (we hope to enter on this enquiry by and bye), perhaps it may be almost assumed that the apostles would, in some degree, connect the words of the Eucharistic institution with the lesson so difficult and mysterious at Capernaum. "In that memorable discourse, he had clearly intimated that His death was to make provision for that divine nutriment, which He was to furnish from Himself. 'The bread from heaven,' said He, 'is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.' When, therefore, just before His entrance on the great concluding scene, He took bread, and having blessed and broken it, gave it to His disciples, saying, 'Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you,' it was impossible not to connect these words, and this act, with the corresponding expressions uttered at Capernaum. When they saw that last Paschal supper (in itself a type of the

Redeemer) formed into a new ordinance, in which the acts of eating and drinking were to have an import, and the aliments fed upon to bear a denomination, identical with the terms of that former announcement; what could be their conclusion, but that not only the ordinance generally, but the specific acts and aliments so distinguished, were to be instrumentally conducive to that divine benefit with which they were thus intimately conjoined?

"The promise, therefore, of our Lord's flesh and blood to be to them meat indeed, and drink indeed, to be the spiritual and eternal life of their souls, by virtue of which He should dwell in them and they in Him, and they should live by Him as He lived by the Father,—this promise, I say, could not, consistently with the terms in which it is expressed, be understood to mean anything less than an inconceivable, but most real, emanation from His divine person, in which there would be the same exercise of His divine power, for the animation and sustenance of the soul, as when divine virtue had gone out of Him for the healing of the body. I conceive they could have given no other interpretation than this to our Lord's prospective assurances. In the appointment, therefore, of visible symbols to be instrumentally effective in conveying the promised blessing, they would see nothing but that which, according to all their experience, was suitable and proportionate. They would, moreover, perceive, that a twofold communication, the flesh and blood of the Redeemer, was provided for by a twofold medium; the lowliness of which evinced only the more, the power of the invisible agent, while, in such an operation, it would not appear unfitting that bread, the prime nourishment of human life, and wine, the prime cherisher of human weakness, should be the material instruments of this heavenly purpose."*

Now in all that has been said, I think we may see that the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is more than a commemorative rite. Indeed, if it be no more than this, how is it of more benefit

* Knox's Doct. Sac. pp. 121—123.

to the worthy communicant than to the unworthy—to the spiritual worshipper, than to the formalist, for both alike commemorate? I believe, however, that it is much more than this, and that it is so for two reasons—1st, Because God works effectually in His own ordinances in the case of His own children; and, 2ndly, Because I cannot conceive it possible that the righteous get no more spiritual good from the observance of the most solemn Christian rite than the careless and profane. There is a great and essential difference between the idea of the *opus operatum*, which supposes the wicked to receive the same benefit as the good in the ordinance, and that view which makes the Eucharist a simple commemoration, and robs the righteous as well as the profane of all blessing whatsoever. These two extremes should be equally avoided. I think the following remarks are consistent at once with both sound reason and scriptural truth:

"It would be obvious, that if the sacrament of the Eucharist had been ordained merely as a commemorative celebration,—that is, if our Redeemer had said nothing more than, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' its institution would have implied rather the injunction of a permanent duty, than the pledge and means of a permanent blessing. In that view it might have afforded an occasion for the more solemn expression of Christian gratitude, or the renewal of Christian obligation; but it could not be thought to give the prospect of any special spiritual benefit, beyond what might be found in an equally ardent exercise of devotion on any other religious occasion. The ordinary grace of God might have been relied upon for co-operation in such an effort of the mind to think more closely on the love of their dying Lord, or to feel it more deeply; but, as it should seem, only as equal efforts would be assisted in the common acts of pious supplication. Yet still, on this ground, it might not have been easy to account satisfactorily for introducing, into a simple commemoration, any outward or visible part. The merely natural effect of the Eucharistic signs on the external senses, would hardly explain their adoption in a religion in which rites and ceremonies were so pro-

fessedly to give place to spiritual worship; and it would be still more difficult to conceive, how the eating and drinking of those visible symbols should be an essential co-ingredient in the exercise of a purely-commemorative devotion."*

Nor let it be supposed that we imagine the effective virtue of the sacramental service to lie in the elements, though communicated through them. It appears quite plain that their effectiveness is dependent on two things,—1st, The will of the Institutor; and, 2nd, the disposition of the recipient. It has been asserted that these are the Calvinistic and Zuinglian views respectively; and if so, each is half true and half false. It would be presumptuous to expect grace through this ordinance, had it not been of divine origin, as it would be profane to deny that the worthy alone receive a blessing through it. "In ascribing to the Eucharistic symbols the instrumental effectiveness with which the significant word of their Divine Master had appeared to invest them, the apostles would see in that institution a provision for their spiritual consolation and benefit, in which all their pre-existing habits of mind were consulted, and all their mental and moral exigencies richly supplied. The nature of the Eucharistic sacrament was clearly such as to have in it no other virtue than what flowed into it from Him by whom it was instituted. The eating of bread, and drinking of wine, had in itself neither conduciveness, nor any obvious congeniality, to a spiritual purpose. It could, therefore, have only that precise import which our Redeemer was pleased to give to it; namely, that it was a visible method appointed by him, of spiritually eating his flesh, and spiritually drinking his blood; and that it must accordingly derive its spiritual efficacy from the concomitancy of His omnipotent power. The Eucharist, when thus regarded, would be, to the disciples of our Lord, such a pledge as was given them in no other instance, of their living by His life, being strong through His strength, and growing in grace by a vital effluence from Himself. . . . .

* Knox's Doct. Sac. p. 125.

In the Eucharistic institution alone, human co-operation could have no share in the effect, because the medium employed could communicate influence or blessing only through the direct operation of Almighty power. It was not to be questioned that, in every instance in which spiritual benefit was conferred, the goodness of God was to be regarded as its supreme source. . . . . In a word, according to the apostle, and that universal belief to which he appeals, the commemorative celebration of the Eucharist as a devotional act, is not that which makes it peculiarly beneficial and venerable; but it is so, because, in this ordinance, the aliments which Christ has appointed, become, through His designation and blessing, the direct vehicles of His own divine influences, to capable receivers."*

Now, I conceive that, in virtue of the divine appointment, this view of the efficacy of the sacramental symbols to all such as oppose no barrier to the reception of the inward grace which is signified and conveyed, is entirely the doctrine of our Church and of Holy Scripture.

The definition of a sacrament, given in our twenty-fifth Article, is this: "Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him." Now, here it is emphatically denied that the sacraments are badges of profession only; but it is further asserted that they are rather "certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace." This language is very remarkable, and evidently adopted after full deliberation. The representative nature of the symbols is twice suggested by the words "witnesses" and "signs," while the epithets "sure" and "effectual" guard against the possibility of such a conception, as that they are *merely* representations. The same is said in the catechism, wherein we are informed that a

* Knox's Doct. Sac. pp. 126, 127, 136.

sacrament is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." The same restrictive phraseology is used in the twenty-seventh Article, where it is said, "Baptism is not only a sign of profession . . . but it is also a sign of regeneration, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church." And, perhaps, more strongly still, "The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." In all which passages it will be seen that the benefit is connected with the outward symbols as means. But, indeed, it is hard to conceive for what purpose they were appointed, unless that they might convey the suggested blessing through the invisible agency of the Holy Spirit's operation.

But while the sacraments, or the sacramental emblems (for unless when we *mean* the outward and inward part together, the word sacrament must refer to the outward part only, as when we say "he received the sacrament"), are the appointed channels of communicating grace, yet are they more than this. For sacraments seem not only to be complex in their character, but to be still more complex in their effects. Thus are they "signs of profession and marks of difference" between Christian men and others. They are also efficient channels of communication, whereby "faith is confirmed, and grace increased, by virtue of prayer to God," which is therein offered, as has been fully shewn; and they are still further "signs and seals" of forgiveness of sins, and of adoption to sonship. And this third office which they sustain, is entirely confirmatory of their efficiency as a means in the second.

And, indeed, this view is the only one which will enable us to distinguish between sacraments and the common rites or ceremonies which are made by the Church. The former are Christ's own appointment as ordinary channels of grace, the latter "badges and signs of Christian men's profession." "A sacrament," says Bishop Burnet, "is an institution of Christ, in which some material thing is sanctified by the use of some form or words, in and by which federal acts of this religion do pass on both sides; on ours by stipulations, professions, or vows; and on God's by his secret assistances: by these we are also united to the body of Christ, which is the Church. It must be instituted by Christ; for though ritual matters, that are only the expressions of our duty, may be appointed by the Church, yet federal acts, to which a conveyance of divine grace is tied, can only be instituted by Him who is the author and mediator of this new covenant, and who lays down the rules or conditions of it, and derives the blessings of it by what methods and in what channels he thinks fit."* It is this makes consecration necessary; for matter being of the essence of a sacrament, any one particular portion can only become peculiarly appropriated when it has been set apart by benediction. A sacrament is, therefore, more than prayers or any other *act* of religious worship, for these are mere acts of the mind; whereas a sacrament is the separation of a portion of visible matter from all profane uses, and applied in a prescribed form to the worship of God. "With the *matter* there must be a *form;* that is, such words joined with it as do appropriate the matter to such an use, and separate it from all other uses, at least in the act of the sacrament. For in any piece of *matter* alone, there cannot be a proper suitableness to such an end, as seems to be designed by sacraments, and therefore a *form* must determine and apply it; and it is highly suitable to the nature of things to believe that our Saviour, who has instituted the sacrament, has also either instituted the form of it, or given us such hints as to lead us very near

* Burnet's Expn. Art. 25.

it. The end of sacraments is double; the one is by a solemn federal action both to unite us to Christ, and also to derive a secret blessing from Him to us: and the other is to join and unite us by this public profession, and the joint partaking of it, with His body, which is the Church."* Now, it is impossible to conceive any reason why these observances should ever have been commanded, and the use of matter enjoined, unless that a blessing might be communicated under the symbols. Indeed, how can we conceive that our gracious Saviour could appoint ceremonies and enjoin duties upon the right observance of which no blessing followed to the pious soul—followed, I mean, *in*, and *by means of*, the institution upon which it was engaged, when no bar was interposed by the observer, either in his act or his intention? "Let it be carefully noted, that it is not merely a *duty* of ours, but a *sacred rite* (in which God Himself bears a *part*), that we are labouring to exalt, or rather to do justice to. The doctrine of our Church, and of all Christian churches, early and late, is much the same with what our homilies teach us†—namely, that 'in the sacraments God embraces us, and offereth Himself to be embraced by us;' and that they 'set out to the eyes, and other outward senses, the inward workings of God's free mercy, and seal in our hearts the promises of God.'"‡

Now, it is worthy of remark that no persons, with the exception of the Socinians (and they cannot be called Christians at all), have ever doubted of God's part in the sacrament, whatever they may have doubted of man's. After instancing the participation of one sacrament by infants, where on their part there can be no idea of *duty*, Waterland goes on to say, "I suppose it might be on these and the like considerations, that some *divines* have conceived that a *sacrament*, properly, is rather an application of *God* to men, than of *men* to God. Mr. Scandret, distinguishing a *sacrament*, according to its precise formality, from a *sacrifice*, observes that it is 'an outward visible sign of an invisible grace or favour from

* Burnet's Expn. Art. 25. † Waterland's Review Doct. Euch., p. 469.
‡ Homily on the Common-Prayer and Sacraments.

God to man.'* And Dr. Rymer takes notice, that, according to our Church Catechism, 'a sacrament is not supposed, in its *most essential* part, an application made by men to God, but one *made by God to man.* A gracious condescension of God's, by which He converses with men, and exhibits to them spiritual blessings, &c. God's part is indeed the *whole* that is strictly and properly *sacramental:* the outward and visible signs exhibited are in effect the *voice of God*, repeating His promise of that inward and spiritual favour.'† Dr. Towerson long before had observed, that there is a *difficulty* as to 'shewing that a sacrament relates equally to that which passeth from us to God, and that it imports our duty and service."‡ He conceived no difficulty at all as to *God's part* in a sacrament; that was a clear point: but he thought it not so easy to prove that the strict and proper sense of the word *sacrament* includes *man's part* at all. However, it is very certain that the whole transaction, in the case of *adults*, is between two parties, and that the application is *mutual* between God and man. And this must be acknowledged, particularly in the Eucharist, by as many as do allow of a *Consecration-prayer*, and do admit that service to be part of our *religious worship*, as also to be a *federal* rite. But from hence may appear how widely they mistake who consider a sacrament as a bare *human performance*, a discharge of a *positive duty* on man's part, and nothing more, throwing out what belongs to God, and what is most strictly *sacramental.* It is sinking or dropping the noblest and most essential part of the *idea*, and presenting us with a very lame and insufficient account of the *thing*."§

Now, I take this to be a very satisfactory view of the value to be assigned to the elements in the Eucharist. They are visible signs of what the Divine Being who instituted them intends to confer upon the soul; and the effect produced upon the body by the participation of the elements is an exact counterpart to the

* Scandret, Sacrifice of the Divine Service, p. 54.
† Rymer, General Representation of Revealed Religion, pp. 286, 287.
‡ Towerson on the Sacraments, p. 12. § Waterland, Review Doct. Sac. 469, 70.

effect produced upon the soul, in the case of the worthy receiver; and as the benefit to the body is only secured by reception of the visible elements, so the benefit to the soul is only to be obtained by the reception of the thing signified; and, moreover, as the symbol is declared in the institution of the sacrament to be the thing which it represents, so it would seem that, with the reception of the one, the reception of the other is secured; unless, as is always to be remembered, any barrier be opposed by the recipient; for the participation of the thing signified can no more take place when the mind is incapable, than the elements could be partaken of where there was a physical incapability. When the masticative and digestive organs are in healthy operation, then the body is strengthened and refreshed; and this alone can properly be called the reception of the elements. So, also, when the soul is in a state of penitent dependence upon the Spirit's blessings, or Christ's grace, then it will be strengthened and refreshed by the spiritual nourishment provided. In short, that opinion seems to be the correct one, which is delivered by Bishop Burnet in the following words:

"Others think that the Eucharist is a federal act, in which, as on the one hand we renew our baptismal covenant with God; so, on the other hand, we receive in the sacrament a visible consignation, as in a tradition by a symbol or pledge of the blessings of the new covenant, which they think is somewhat superadded to those returns of our prayers, or of other inward acts.

"This, they think, answers the nourishment which the body receives from the symbols of bread and wine; and stands in opposition to that of the unworthy receivers being guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; and their eating and drinking that which will bring some judgment upon themselves. This they also found on these words of St. Paul, 'The cup of blessing that we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?'

"St. Paul considers the bread, which was offered by the people,

as an emblem of their unity, that as there was one loaf, so they were one body; and that they were all partakers of that one loaf: from hence it is inferred, that since the word rendered communion, signifies a communication in fellowship, or partnership, that therefore the meaning of it is, that in the sacrament there is a distribution made in that symbolical action of the death of Christ, and of the benefits and effects of it. The communion of the Holy Ghost, is a common sharing in the effusion of the Spirit: the same is meant by that, if there is any fellowship of the Spirit; that is, if we do all partake of the Spirit, we are said to have a fellowship in the sufferings of Christ, in which every one must take his share. The communication, or fellowship, of the mystery of the Gospel (2 Cor. xiii., last verse; Phil. ii., 1; Eph. iii., 9; Phil. iii., 10), was its being shared equally among both Jews and Gentiles; and the fellowship in which the first converts to Christianity lived, was their liberal distribution to one another, they holding all things in common. In these and some other places, it is certain that communion signifies somewhat that is more real and effectual, than merely men's owning themselves to be joined together in a society: which it is true it does also often signify: and, therefore, they conclude, that as in bargains or covenants, the ancient method of them before writings were invented was the mutual delivering of some pledges, which were the symbols of that faith, which was so plighted, instead of which, the sealing and delivering of writings is now used among us: so our Saviour instituted this in compliance with our frailty, to give us an outward and sensible pledge of his entering into covenant with us, of which the bread and wine are constituted the symbols."*

It must not be thought, that the opinion which makes the elements the channel of communication, at all sanctions the Popish idea of transubstantiation. It no more does this than the saying that pipes convey water from a cistern asserts that they are

* Burnet's Expn. Art. 28.

the water. The vehicle is not the thing which it conveys. And again, it by no means follows, from this Protestant doctrine, that the wicked receive the body and blood of Christ, because they are in connection with the channel by which these are conveyed. If the elements were physical, and not moral instruments (which the Popish doctrine makes them, and which compels those who believe it to assert, that the wicked as well as the righteous receive the thing signified, together with the emblems), then without doubt all who received the one would of necessity receive the other, and the Papists would be right. It is not so, however, and the character of the recipient being that which gives its value to the element, and not the element by reception, its character to the recipient, it follows that reprobates are not bettered by uniting with the good in the sacred feast, which is fatness to these, but rather leanness and a blight to those. For, instead of gaining aught from the participation, they become responsible for the abuse of the most solemn of all the ordinances of the Christian religion, and of turning what should be for their health into an occasion of falling. The food of the devout is the poison of the sinner.

It is well known that Bishop Ridley was of this opinion as to a real connection between the symbols and the effectual grace communicated to true believers; and it is probable that the Articles, as they have been quoted above, are in his language. When, under the influence of Bucer, the second prayer-book of King Edward VI. was published, ignoring, through the communion service, to a very great extent, such an idea as the above, Ridley wrote to his friend and former chaplain, saying that it "had chanced him to mislike some things" in *recent times;* "for," says he, "sudden changes, without substantial and necessary cause, and the heady setting forth of extremities, I never did love."* Besides, we know that, up to the last hour of his life, Ridley retained the same opinion, when he wrote that he believed the elements not

* Ridley's Life of Ridley, p. 578, apud Knox.

mere memorials alone, but a *lively* representation of Christ's body; not only a figure, but, by means of a sacramental mutation, through the omnipotency of Christ's word, they were made *effectually* to represent His body.*

The change which was intimated in the new service book (for it was hardly more than intimated, it was nowhere explicitly stated, much less insisted upon), is seen as clearly in the change of words made use of in the delivery of the elements as in any alteration. The prayer-book of 1549, on the delivery, appointed these words to be used:—"The body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given (shed) for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." This was altered, in the form of 1552, into "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving." "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful." It is here apparent that the change was intended to ignore the *efficiency* of the elements, and to make the sacramental service a purely commemorative rite. On the accession of Elizabeth these words were retained, but the earlier form was prefixed to them. Thus the Church of England returned to the language as well as belief of the primitive Church, and teaches us, to this day, that the elements are *effectual* signs of grace, as well as commemorative of that which was the sole meritorious cause of blessing to the Church,—viz., the death of Christ upon the cross on Calvary.

But it is not alone in the communion service that the efficiency

* "A still later writer, of at least equal weight and celebrity (Bishop Horsley) may, however, be adduced, as strictly agreeing with Ridley. In one of his charges to the clergy of Rochester we find the following passage:—'But the frequency of the celebration will be of little use, unless your people are well instructed in the nature and use of this most holy and mysterious ordinance. If they are suffered to consider it as nothing more than a rite of simple commemoration of Christ's death, a mere external form of thanksgiving on the part of the receiver, they will never come to it with due reverence. You will instruct them, therefore, in the true notion of a sacrament; that the sacraments are not only signs of grace, but means of the grace signified, the *matter of the sacrament* being by Christ's appointment, and the operation of the Holy Spirit, *the vehicle of grace* to the believer's soul.'"—Knox's Doct. Sac. pp. 109, 10.

of the symbols is taught, but as before remarked, in the Articles, most strongly. When, as in the twenty-fifth Article, the sacraments are said to be "effectual signs of grace, by the which God doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but strengthen and confirm our faith in Him," it is impossible to mistake the meaning of such language. Again, in the twenty-eighth Article, it is said that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only, after a heavenly and spiritual manner," where it is manifest that something more, and far more specifically, is inculcated than that the receiver feeds upon Christ by faith; for thus, there would be no meaning in the words *given*, *taken*, and *eaten*. And if the body of Christ be *given*, and *taken*, and *eaten*, it must be with the symbols.

But the presence and the mode of presence is altogether different in the opinion of the Church of England and that of Rome; and not otherwise conveyed to, and partaken of by, the communicant, than as it pleases God, by His divine grace, to convey blessings to the soul of the spiritual worshipper, as is entirely manifest by the utter reprobation by the Church of any idea of a necessary, corporeal, or physical giving, taking, and eating, as is expressed in the twenty-eighth Article. There it is emphatically denied that the wicked do take, eat, or participate of the body of Christ, but do merely "eat the sign or sacrament of so great a thing," and that, too, "to their own condemnation."

The same idea, as remarked above, runs strongly through the catechism as well as the other parts of the prayer-book. Thus, that elementary form teaches us that a sacrament is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself as a *means* whereby we receive the same and a pledge to assure us thereof;" and it is just as explicitly stated that the inward part is *thereby* "received by the *faithful* in the Lord's Supper." Thus, while guarding, on the one hand, against Romish heresies by a careful and oft-reiterated declaration that it is the *faithful* only who partake of "the gift," yet our Church seems just as careful to preserve and teach the

scriptural, primitive, Catholic doctrine, that this solemn and divine rite is not an unmeaning ceremony, nor only a ceremony of some representative significance; but that it is an effectual mode of communication of God's own appointment between Himself and the pious soul: a channel whereby the Holy Spirit imparts His gifts and graces to the faithful worshipper: an ordinance conveying, in virtue of its divine appointment, every needful blessing from our heavenly Father, to the heart possessed of a lively faith; but, in its abuse, heaping up wrath against the day of wrath to those who will presume to rush to it unworthily. This sound doctrine is as scriptural as it is antagonistic to Trent; as Catholic as it is un-Romish; as encouraging and effectual for good to the worthy, as it is awful and productive of evil to the godless and reprobate.

CHAPTER II.

A REVIEW OF THE PASSAGES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT HAVING SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE EUCHARIST.

HAVING settled the true view which ought to be taken of the use and value of the sacramental symbols, we will next proceed to consider the texts in which a special reference is made to the Eucharist in the New Testament. It is not to be expected that those who have in their hands the Word of God should be satisfied with the word of man. And, as we are able to read what was said and done at the institution of the Lord's Supper by the Divine Head of the Church, and what was thought and taught with respect to it by an inspired apostle, we are enabled to exercise our own judgments upon the original transaction and the authoritative comments upon it, with the same advantages for the most part, as have been enjoyed by Christians in every age of the Church since that of the apostles. We will, therefore, now turn our attention to the basis of our faith and practice in this, as in in all other matters; trusting that the "Spirit of Truth" which indicted, will also be pleased graciously to "guide us into all truth" in this matter. As no prophecy of the Scriptures is of any private interpretation, —but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,—so, as that Spirit is still the instructor of the Church (though now in explaining and unfolding, what once He suggested), looking to Him with prayerful dependence, we may also look with the full assurance of faith that He will not fail the sincere inquirer.

The first passage to consider is evidently that in which the

evangelists and St. Paul record the institution. St. Matthew's account of the transaction is—"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."* The account given by Mark and Luke are very similar, save that the latter, as also St. Paul when reviewing the transaction, gives the command for its perpetuation—"Do this in remembrance of me."

Now, one would imagine that, whatever virtue might be supposed to be imparted to the bread and the wine by the blessing which had been pronounced over them, yet they would be considered to remain in all other respects what they were before; and that when it was said "This is my body," "This is my blood," it was simply a figurative expression, equivalent to the same kind of comparison when made in other instances, as when Jesus said, "I am the door," "I am the vine," &c., or, as St. Paul says, "That rock was Christ." Such, however, has not always been considered the import of the phrase, but the words are considered by some to express rigidly the idea conveyed in their most literal interpretation. It is, therefore, argued, both from the words themselves, and from the construction of the sentence in the Greek, that the expression, "This is my body," is a proposition of identity.

Now, it would appear to be amply sufficient, to secure this passage from a rigid literal interpretation, to remember the flowery and figurative modes in which the oriental nations were wont to express themselves. If, in addition to this, that be correct which is so frequently urged,—that the Syro-Chaldaic language had no verb for, "to represent," then was necessitated, to a considerable

* Matt. xxvi., 26—29.

extent, the form of speech which we find. If, moreover, the form of distribution at the paschal feast among the Jews was, "This is the bread of affliction, which our fathers ate in Egypt," &c.; and, with respect to the lamb, "This is the body of the passover," &c.;* and we recollect that the institution of the Eucharist took place at the time of its celebration, we can see another important reason why Jesus Christ should have adopted the form of words which he did. It appears to me, on each and all of these grounds together, that the words in question do not contain a proposition of "identity," nor will allow of a literal interpretation.

But it is said that the construction of the sentence, in the Greek, requires this interpretation. It is argued that *τοῦτό εστι τὸ σῶμά μου* cannot mean "This *bread* is my body," for in that case it would have been *οὗτος*, to agree with *ἄρτος*, but this by no means follows. Every scholar knows that it is not only optional with which of two nouns to which a relative or demonstrative refers, he shall make it agree; but it is more usual, indeed the rule, to make it agree with the latter. Dr. Williams, bishop of Colchester, reviews this objection as follows:

* "*Ver.* 26. 'This is my body.' What is the full importance of this phrase,—*τοῦτό εστι τὸ σῶμά μου*, 'This is my body,'—is a difficulty, which may, perhaps, be cleared by degrees, by premising these few observations: First, from the Jewish phrases and customs, that the Lamb, dressed in the paschal supper, and set upon the table as a sacrificial feast or festival sacrifice, was wont to be called גופו של פסח (the body of the passover), or גופו של כבש הפסח (the body of the paschal Lamb). So, in the Talmud, De Pasch. c. ult. R. M. Maim: in Hilchos Camets umatzah, c. viii. ss. 1, 7. So in Mekilta, fol. 4. col. 1. To which phrase or form of speech among them Christ may probably allude when he saith, 'This is my body;' making Himself, that was now to be slain for them, answerable to that paschal Lamb—as by Paul he is called our passover, that is sacrificed for us—and so mentioning this crucifixion of His, in that form by which the presentation of the Lamb on the table in the Jewish feast, whereof they were to eat by God's appointment, was wont to be expressed. This for the words *σῶμά μου*—'My body.' Secondly, for the *τοῦτό εστι*—'This is;' or the whole phrase, *τοῦτό εστι τὸ σῶμά μου*—'This is my body.' This seems to be by Christ substituted instead of the paschal form, לחמא הא דעניא, 'This is the bread of affliction, which our fathers eat in Egypt;' or, 'This is the unleavened bread,' &c, or, 'This is the passover.' Where it is evident that that is not the identical bread which their fathers in Egypt eat, but only the transcript of it, the commemoration of that Egyptian state of slavery, from which they had been delivered, and the celebration of that annual feast which, in Egypt, was first instituted."—Hammond's Par. and Ann. New Test. p. 131.

"1. As it is ordinary in Latin and Greek, when the substantive is understood, or the antecedent is going before, to put the relative (whatever gender the substantive is of) in the neuter gender, as John vi., 61, τοῦτο, 'Doth this offend you?' that is, Christ's coming from heaven; so 1 Cor. xi., 24, 25, τοῦτο, 'this;' that is, take and eat.

"2. When the substantive, properly belonging to the adjective, is not immediately repeated with the adjective, the adjective may be in the neuter gender, as Gen. ii., 23, τοῦτο ὀστοῦν, 'this is bone,' where the word γυνὴ, 'woman,' is the antecedent.

"3. It is common, again, in Greek and Latin, to put the relative in the same gender with the consequent, as in the foregoing instance, τοῦτο ὀστοῦν, which the vulgar Latin reads *hoc est os.* And so, when the sentence going before, was the antecedent, yet we find the relative is in the feminine, if the consequent substantive be so, as Ezek. v., 5, αὐτὴ ἡ Ἰερουσαλὴμ, 'this is Jerusalem.' So St. Cyprian, '*hæc est caro mea.*'*

"Now, it happens that there is none of these but what is applicable to our case. For, (1.) The antecedent may be the sentence going before, and the bread, and the breaking, giving, taking, eating, may be the body of Christ by signification; as the lamb, the taking, killing, dressing, and eating, is said to be the Lord's passover, Exod, xii., 11. And the hair, the burning, smiting, and scattering it, is said to be Jerusalem, Ezek. v., 5. (2.) The substantive is not repeated with, nor immediately connected to the adjective. (3.) And the noun consequent to τοῦτο, *this*, is σῶμα of the neuter gender; and consequently in all points, nothing more regular and grammatical."†

Indeed, irrespective of these incontrovertible proofs that there is nothing in the Greek to prevent *this* referring to the bread, it is proved by the Romanists that it is easier to make objections than to find solutions; for when they are asked, to what τοῦτο, *this*, can refer, they are all at sea, and not more at variance with Protestants than among themselves. Thus it cannot, with safety, be affirmed to refer strictly to σῶμα, *body*, because, until the words have all been pronounced, the transubstantiation has not taken place. These words are the charm which, being spoken, work the change; and, before they have been spoken, the change has not been wrought. This is acknowledged by many Romanists,

* De Cœna Dom. † See Gibson's Pres. from Pop. vol. ix. p. 380. Ref. Soc. Ed.

of whom some writers say, that the *this* refers to the bread which is as yet unchanged; others, to the species; others explain it by *this thing*, though what they mean by the expression they are unable to say. It is thus seen that the idea of taking our Lord's words, in their simplest acceptation, only leads to difficulties, where a figurative interpretation allows of none whatever. In fact, a literal interpretation of this expression creates not only difficulties of explanation, but of a physical character. A miracle is asserted, which is a stumbling-block to faith and a laughing-stock to reason — which cannot convince, because it is unseen; which cannot convert, because it is uninfluential. In no other instance have we ever heard of an unmeaning, objectless, ineffectual exercise of power divine!

The following clear reasoning of Bishop Kidder will at once dispose of the pretence that there is a proposition of "identity" enunciated in the expression "This is my body:"

"*This.* If by *this* be meant 'this bread,' here will be no strength to be had from it for supporting those doctrines of the Church of Rome. And by *this* must be meant Christ's body, or bread, or nothing at all. To say that by *this* Christ meant His body, is to suppose Him to say that His body is His body; but if He said that this bread was His body, then is not our Protestant interpretation of the words to be rejected, nor the sense of the Romanists to be admitted. And that by *this* our Saviour meant 'this bread,' is infinitely plain to any that are unprejudiced. What did He take? The text tells us that He 'took bread;'* what he took he also blessed and brake, and gave; of this he said, 'Take, eat,' and then adds, 'This is my body.' This will be put out of doubt if, by the following *this*, in those words, 'This is my blood,' by *this* be meant 'this cup,' no reason can be assigned why *this* (Matt. xxvi., 26) should not denote 'this bread,' if *this* (ver. 28) denote 'this cup.' It is true St. Matthew and St. Mark, having mentioned the cup which Jesus took and blessed, and gave, tell us that Jesus said, 'This is my blood.'† And though it be plain, from what goes before, that by *this* is meant 'this cup,' yet we have further proof of it still. For whereas St. Matthew and St. Mark say only *this*, St. Luke and St.

* Matt. xxvi., 26, with ver. 28.

† Matt. xxvi., 28; Mark xiv., 24; with Luke xxii., 20, and 1 Cor. x., 16 and chap. xi., 26, 27, 28.

Paul say 'this cup.' And having this warrant by *this* in the latter words to understand 'this cup,' where lies the blame when, by *this* in the former, we understand 'this bread?' I proceed:

"*Is.* This verb is interpretable according to the subject matter; but where it is used of a sacrament, and enjoins the sign and thing signified together, and where another sense contended for is destructive to our senses and against reason and other Scripture, it is reasonable to understand it to import the same with the word *signifieth;* and that is the present case. Nor is there any more common than this way of speaking in the Holy Scriptures, in other authors and common conversation. This verb here cannot be understood in the sense of the Church of Rome, as implying transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass; because that change of substance they speak of is not effected till these words, 'This is my body,' are fully pronounced; and, therefore, this not being effected till the last syllable be pronounced (according to our adversaries), it cannot be said to *be* before it hath received its *being.* The pronunciation of the words must be precedent to the being of the thing; and therefore cannot be true before they are fully pronounced. According to our adversaries, the real presence of Christ in the sacrament (which they contend for) must be the cause and effect of the truth of this proposition, 'This is my body.' If their doctrine be not true, the proposition is false in the sense they take it in. Again, if their doctrine be true, the proposition pronounced by a priest makes it so. And whereas, elsewhere, the existence of a thing makes good the proposition, here the proposition makes good the thing.

"*My body.* By His body, our Lord must mean what was known to be so, and what had the properties of a human body. The disciples were gross, and apt enough to take spiritual things in a carnal sense, when the letter gave them any occasion so to do.* They had not so quick an apprehension as to conquer all the difficulties of the Romish doctrine. They could not comprehend the miracle said to be wrought by the words of consecration. They were not easily convinced that Christ was risen from the dead, even after many proofs of it and predictions to that purpose. It is not to be imagined that they would eat human flesh and drink blood, and believe Jesus sacrificed and alive at the same time; at the same entire, and yet consumed; and eaten entirely by each of them, and in every the least crumb of bread that was taken."†

But it is not modern Protestants alone who assert that the

* Matt. xvi., 6, 11, 12. John vi., 32, 33. † Bishop Kidder's "Texts Examined."

reference of *this*, in the words of tradition, is to the bread. The Fathers as expressly declare, that that which was given, taken, and eaten by the apostles, at the institution, was bread, although they do not hesitate to use our Lord's words with respect to it very freely, wherein He declared it was His body.

It must be remembered that the leading advocates of the Romish Church acknowledge that, if the words of our Lord had been "This bread is my body," they would have been at once decisive of the question and against transubstantiation. The Council of Trent says, that these words respect the whole substance of what is present; but if the substance of bread remain, it seems no way possible to be said, "This is my body." So, also, Bellarmine says, "This bread is my body" must be taken figuratively. "For," he adds, "it cannot be a true proposition, in which the subject is supposed to be bread, and the predicate the body of Christ; for bread and Christ's body are *res diversissimæ*, things most diverse. . . . If we affirm *disparata de disparatis*, different things of one another, you might as well affirm and say, that something is nothing, and nothing something; that light is darkness, and darkness light; that Christ is Belial, and Belial Christ; neither does our faith oblige us to defend those things that evidently imply a contradiction."*

So, also, Vasquez: "If the pronoun *this*, in Christ's words, pointed at the bread, then we confess it would follow, that no conversion could be made by virtue of these words, because the bread, of which it is affirmed (sc. that it is Christ's body) ought to remain."†

Now, the early Christian writers nowhere hesitate to call that which was handed by our Lord to, and received by, the apostles "bread" and "wine;" thus clearly shewing, according to Romish concessions, that they did not believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation. The following authorities, chiefly from Mr. Patrick's collection in his work, "A Full View of the Doctrines and Prac-

* De Euch. lib. iii. cap. 19. † Disp. 180, cap. 9, n. 91.

tices of the Ancient Church relating to the Eucharist," &c., will prove this point to the perfect satisfaction of every reasonable mind:

"St. Irenæus: 'Our Lord confessed the cup which is of the creature to be His blood; and the bread which is of the creature, He confirmed it to be His body,'*

"Clement of Alexandria: 'Our Lord blessed the wine, saying, Take, drink, this is my blood, the blood of the grape. For the holy river of gladness (so he calls the wine) does allegorically signify the Word (*i.e.* the blood of the Word) shed for many for the remission of sins.'†

"Tertullian: 'Calling bread His body.'‡

"And against Marcion he says the same: 'Calling bread His body, that thou mayest know that He gave to bread the figure of His body, &c.'§

"And in the next book: 'The bread that He took and distributed to His disciples, He made it His body, saying, This is my body, that is, the figure of my body.'‖

"St. Cyprian: 'When our Lord called the bread, which is made up of many united grains, His body, &c.'¶

"Tatianus Syrus: 'Christ taking the bread, and after that the cup of wine, testified that they were His body and blood, &c.'**

"Origen: 'That bread which our Lord confessed to be His body.'††

* Adv. Hæres, l. v., c. 2. Τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως ποτήριον αἷμα ἴδιον ὡμολόγησε, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ κτίσεως ἄρτον ἴδιον σῶμα διαβεβαιώσατο. [vol. i., p. 294. Venet. 1734],

† Pædag., l. ii., c. 2. Εὐλόγησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπὼν, Λάβετε, πίετε, τοῦτο μού ἐστι τὸ αἷμα, αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου· τὸν λόγον τὸν περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εὐφροσύνης ἅγιον ἠλληγόρει ναᾶμα. [p. 186. Venet. 1757].

‡ Adv. Judæos, c. 21. Panem corpus suum appellans.

§ Idem adv. Marcion. l. iii., cap. 19. Panem corpus suum appellans, ut et hinc eum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse, &c. [Ibid. p. 408].

‖ Lib. iv., advers. Marc., c. 40. Acceptum panem et distributum Discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est figura corporis mei. [Ibid. pp. 457, 458].

¶ Epist. 76. ad Magnum. Quando Dominus corpus suum panem vocat de multorum granorum adunatione congestum, &c. [p. 318. Venet. 1728].

** Harmon. in Bibl. Patrum, 1624. tom. vii. Accepto pane, deinde vini calice, corpus esse suum ac sanguinem testatus, &c. [Max. Biblioth. Vet. Patr., vol. ii., p. 210. col. 1. Lugd. 1677].

†† Hom. 35. in Matth. Panis iste quem Dominus corpus suum esse fatetur. [vol. iii., p. 898. Par. 1740].

"Eusebius: 'Christ appointed them (or delivered to them) to make use of bread for a symbol of His body'*

"Cyril of Jerusalem: 'When Christ affirms, and says of the bread, This is my body, who will dare to doubt further of it?'†

"St. Jerome: 'Let us hear, that the bread which our Lord brake and gave to His disciples, is the body of our Saviour.'‡ (Which he explains further elsewhere): 'That as Melchisedec prefiguring Him had done, when He offered bread and wine, so He also represented the truth of His body and blood.'§

"St. Chrysostom: 'What is the bread? The body of Christ. What do they become that receive it? The body of Christ. Not many bodies, but one body.'‖

"St. Austin: 'What your faith is to be instructed in is, That the bread is the body of Christ, and the cup the blood of Christ.'¶

"And elsewhere: 'Our Lord doubted not to affirm, This is my body, when He gave the sign of His body.'**

"Gaudentius: 'When our Lord reached the consecrated bread and wine to His disciples, He said thus, This is my body.††

"Cyril of Alexandria: 'Christ, when He had broken the bread, as it is written, distributed it, saying, This is my body.'‡‡

* Demonstr. Evang., lib. viii. *Ἄρτῳ δὲ χρῆσθαι, συμβόλῳ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος παρεδίδου.*

† Catech. Mystag. 4. *Αὐτοῦ ἀποφηνομένου καὶ εἰπόντος περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, τίς τολμήσει ἀμφιβάλλειν λοιπόν;* [p. 320. Venet. 1763].

‡ Epist. ad Hedibiam. Nos audiamus panem quem fregit Dominus, deditque discipulis suis, esse corpus salvatoris, &c. [vol. i., p. 818. Veron. 1734].

§ Comm. in 26. Matt. Quomodo in præfiguratione ejus Melchisedek . . . panem et vinum offerens fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis et sanguinis repræsentaret. [Ibid. vol. vii., p. 216].

‖ In 1 Cor. Hom. 24. *Τί γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος; Σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Τί δὲ γίνονται οἵ μεταλαμβάνοντες; Σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Οὐχὶ σώματα πολλά, ἀλλὰ σῶμα ἕν.* [vol. x., p. 250. Par. 1837].

¶ Serm. ad recens baptizat. apud Fulgentium, Bedam, &c. Quod fides vestra postulat instruenda, Panis est corpus Christi, Calix sanguis Christi. [Serm. 272. vol v., p. 1614. Par. 1837].

** Contr. Adimantum, c. 12. Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum daret signum corporis sui. [Ibid. vol. viii., p. 224].

†† In Exod. tract. 2. Cum panem consecratum et vinum discipulis suis porrigeret Dominus, sic ait, Hoc est corpus meum. [Max. Bibl. Vet. Patr. vol. v., p. 947. col. 2. Lugd. 1677].

‡‡ In Joan. xx., 26. 27. *Διακλάσας τὸν ἄρτον, καθ' ὃ γέγραπται, διεδίδου, λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου,* &c. [vol. iv., p. 1105. Lut. 1638.]

" Theophilus Antioch, or the author under his name upon the Gospel, speaks just St. Cyprian's language: 'When Jesus said, This is my body, He called the bread His body, which is made up of many grains, by which he would represent the people, &c.'*

" Theodoret: 'In the delivery of the mysteries, He called the bread His body, and that which is mixed (wine and water in the cup) blood. . . . And afterwards, He honoured the visible symbols with the appellation of His body and blood, &c.'†

" Facundus Hermian: 'Our Lord Himself called the blessed bread and cup which He delivered to His disciples, His body and blood.'‡

" Maxentius, speaking of the Church, that is called Christ's body, adds, 'also the bread, which the whole Church partakes of in memory of the Lord's passion, is His body.'§

" Isidore of Seville says, 'We call this, by His command, the body and blood of Christ, which, being made of the fruits of the earth, is sanctified and made a sacrament, by the invisible operation of the Spirit of God.'‖

" Bede: 'Christ said to His disciples, This is my body, &c., because bread strengthens the body, and wine produces blood in the flesh; this relates mystically to Christ's body, and that to His blood.'¶

" 'The seventh general council at Constantinople, after reciting the words of the institution, 'This is my body,' after His taking, and blessing, and breaking it, adds, 'Behold the image of His life-giving body made preciously and honourably.' And afterwards, 'It pleased Him that the bread of the sacrament, being the true figure of His natural flesh, should be made a divine body, being sanctified by the coming of the Holy Ghost upon it, &c.'**

* Com. in Matt. 26.

† In Dialog. 1. Ἐν δέ γε τῶν μυστηρίων παραδόσει, σῶμα τὸν ἄρτον ἐκάλεσε, καὶ αἷμα τὸ κρᾶμα. Τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, &c. [vol. iv., p. 26. Hal. 1733].

‡ In Defens. 3. capit. lib. ix., c. ult. Ipse Dominus benedictum panem et calicem quem discipulis tradidit, corpus et sanguinem suum vocavit.

§ Dialog. ii., c. 13. Sed est panis ille, quem universa Ecclesia in memoriam Dominicæ passionis participat, corpus ejus.

‖ Originum, lib. vi., cap. 19. Hoc, eo jubente, corpus Christi et sanguinem dicimus, quod dum fit ex fructibus terræ, sanctificatur et fit sacramentum, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei. [p. 52. col. 1. Colon. Agr. 1617].

¶ Comm. in Marc. 14.—Quia panis corpus confirmat, vinum vero sanguinem operatur in carne, hic ad corpus Christi mysticè, illud refertur ad sanguinem.

** Extat. in Conc. Nicen ii. Art. 6. Ἰδοὺ οὖν ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐντίμως καὶ τετιμημένως πραττομένη. Τὸν τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἄρτον, ὡς ἀψευδῆ εἰκόνα τῆς φυσικῆς σαρκὸς, διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως ἁγιαζόμενον, θεῖον σῶμα εὐδόκησε γίνεσθαι. [Labbe, Concil., vol. vii., pp. 446, 447. Lut. Par. 1761.]

"Druthmarus: 'This is my body, that is to say, in a sacrament; because, among all things that are the food of life, bread and wine serve to strengthen and refresh our weaknesses, it is with great reason that He would in these two things establish the mystery of His sacrament. For wine both cheers us and increases blood, and therefore very fitly the blood of Christ is figured by it; because whatsoever comes to us from Him, cheers us with true joy, and increaseth all good in us.'*

"Rabanus Maurus, explaining the words of institution, says, 'Because bread strengthens the body, therefore it is fitly called the body of Christ; and wine, because it produces blood in our flesh, is therefore referred to the blood of Christ.'†

"In the Æthiopic churches they use this phrase (which the Church of Rome is so shy of), 'This bread is my body.'‡

"Bertram: 'I am confident, no Christian doubts but that bread was made the body of Christ which He gave to His disciples, saying, This is my body,' &c.; and he there shews that this is made by the same change, whereby the manna and the water of the rock in the wilderness were turned into His body and blood.§

"To conclude this head: it is plain that there is a general consent of Fathers on the Protestant side in this particular, that the bread and wine are Christ's body and blood. And it is the more remarkable, because they give us this sense when they are explaining Christ's words, and in their commentaries upon the gospels where the words of institution are recorded."

It is perfectly useless to comment on testimonies so numerous, clear, and explicit. It is manifest that, in consenting to Protestant modes of speech, the Fathers held Protestant doctrines. Nor is it necessary to adduce any passages from the Fathers to shew

* Comm. in Matt. xxvi. Hoc est corpus meum; id est, in sacramento.—Quia inter omnes vitæ alimonias cibus panis et vinum valent ad confirmandam et recreandam nostram infirmitatem, recte per hæc duo mysterium sui sacramenti confirmare placuit. Vinum namque et lætificat et sanguinem auget; et idcirco non inconvenienter sanguis Christi per hoc figuratur, quoniam quicquid nobis ab ipso venit lætificat lætitiâ verâ, et auget omne bonum nostrum.

† Comm. in Matt. xxvi. Quia panis confirmat corpus, ideo corpus ille Christi congruentur nuncupatur, vinum autem quia sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo ad sanguinem Christi refertur.

‡ Ludolphi Æthiop. Hist., lib. iii., c. 5. n. 56. Hic panis est corpus meum.

§ De Corp. et Sang. Dom. p. 40. late Eng. et. Lat. Translation. Non putamus ullum fidelium dubitare, panem illum fuisse corpus Christi effectum, quod Discipulis donans dicit, Hoc est corpus meum, &c. [p. 166. Lond. 1688].

that they held the efficacy of the elements in the case of pious receivers. Indeed, it is the strong and unguarded expressions which they have made use of on this subject, which are now often quoted as proofs of their belief in the peculiar doctrines of Rome. To transcribe their testimony on this head, would be to transcribe a great portion of their writings; and as it is entirely a work of supererogation to prove that which no one disputes, I shall pass on to consider, in the next place, the conversation of our Lord with the people of Capernaum, recorded in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John.

The next alleged Scripture authority for the peculiar views of the Romish Church on the doctrine of the Eucharist, is the latter portion of the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John. It is true, indeed, that, of late years, many of the most eminent of the controversial writers of that Church have denied all reference to this sacrament in the chapter;* and this they do in order to get rid of the very serious difficulty into which they otherwise fall, in consequence of denying the cup to the laity, and all except the officiating priest. Our Lord declares so emphatically in this chapter, that unless we eat the flesh of the Son of Man, *and drink his blood*, we have no life in us, that it is felt there is no evading the heaviest and most decided condemnation of "communion in one kind," but by abandoning the chapter. This has not always been done; and, indeed, it must be felt a tremendous sacrifice of Scripture proof for other parts of the Romish doctrine, thus to give up this conversation at Capernaum. But as sailors throw overboard all their cargo and stores to save their lives, so

* They are thus ranged by Albertinus de Euch. lib. i., cap. 30, p. 299. Two Popes —Innocent III., Pius II. Four cardinals—Bonaventure, D'Alliaco, Cusan, Cajetan. Two archbishops—Richardus Armachanus, and Guererius Granatensis. Five bishops —Stephanus Eduensis, Durandus Mimatensis, Gulielmus Altisiodorensis, Lindanus Ruremondensis, and Jansenius Gandavensis. Doctors and professors of divinity in great abundance—Alexander Alensis, Richardus de media villa. Jo. Jerson, Jo. de Ragusio, Gabriel Biel, Thomas Waldensis, Author. tract. contr. perfidiam quorundam Bohemorum, Jo. Maria Verratus, Tilmannus Segebergensis, Astesanus, Conradus, Jo. Ferus, Conradus, Sasgerus, Jo. Hesselius, Ruardus Tapperus, Palatius, and Rigaltius Here are thirty of the Roman Church, who reject this application of this chapter.

these, to keep the ship from absolutely foundering, throw overboard what they must feel to be most precious treasure.

Bishop Cleaver, in his three sermons, has undoubtedly constructed a very plausible parallelism between the third and sixth of John as to the doctrine of the two sacraments, and gives it as his opinion that the holy communion was the thing in our Lord's mind during the whole discourse with the Capernaites. But it is still not so clear that there is any reference intended to the sacrament in the latter as in the former chapter; for of the Eucharist men knew nothing, but with baptism they were well acquainted. It was not at all in unusual language, nor on an unknown subject,* that Jesus discoursed with Nicodemus; but with the Jews at Capernaum it was very different, if the allusion was intended which is insisted upon. It was wholly impossible that our Lord could have been understood had such been the case, and there would have been a greater barrier in the way of understanding Him, than if we suppose Him speaking of receiving His doctrine, and equal to what would have existed had He spoken of participating in the merits of His death. With the explanation afforded, either of the latter was, possibly, capable of being understood, the former of the two certainly. The shadow of the idea of sacramental eating could not by possibility have once entered the thoughts of the auditory.

But, if it were admitted that the discourse recorded in John vi. had reference to the Eucharist, it would be as far off as ever from supporting the doctrine of transubstantiation. There is no such

* There are but few who are not aware that, when Jesus Christ instituted baptism as the rite of admission into His Church, he but adopted what the Jews had long practised. The following quotation from Maimonides shews the universality of the practice:—"And so, in all ages, when an ethnic is willing to enter into the covenant, and gather himself under the wing of the majesty of God, and take upon him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised and baptized and bring a sacrifice; or if it be a woman, be baptized and bring a sacrifice. As it is written, 'As you are, so shall the stranger be' (Num. xv., 15). How are you? By circumcision, and baptism, and bringing of a sacrifice. So, likewise, the stranger (or proselyte) through all generations—by circumcision, and baptism, and bringing of a sacrifice.'"—Isuri Bia, c. 13, apud Wall's Infant Baptism.

idea in any one verse of the chapter. The change is, through the whole discourse, in the wrong direction to give any countenance to Rome. It might be argued from it, that the Eucharist was the impanation of Christ, but not transubstantiation. In no case does Jesus say that He would make bread His body, but always that His flesh was bread.

Now, surely no one could say that these are the same thing. Yet the advocates of Paschasius's doctrine say that the latter is what is taught, in direct contravention of the words, many times repeated. Would any one have the hardihood to assert, that the change effected at Cana, and recorded in the second of John, was the change of wine into water? Yet their daring is not less who prove transubstantiation by the sixth chapter. A drowning man will catch at straws.

But our Lord's own explanation, given more than once in the chapter itself, will afford the best clue to the meaning. "And Jesus said, I am the bread of life: *he that cometh to me shall never hunger, he that believeth on me shall never thirst*" (ver. 35). Now, this is as plain as though it were said, I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me eateth me, he that believeth on me drinketh me. For it differs nothing but in emphasis, to put the effect of eating, *never hunger*, and the effect of drinking, *never thirst*, for the operations themselves. The expressions actually used, are only stronger than what I have substituted, and give a key to unlock every difficulty of the discourse which follows them.

Yet this is not all. Not only did the Divine Instructor suggest the solution of His figurative discourse as He began it, but He also intimated its solution when He had finished. When He heard that some murmured, He asked the question, "Doth this offend you?" and, not to allow them to depart under misapprehension, He adds, "It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

Now, all these considerations compel us to the conviction, that

not only did our Lord not allude to the Eucharist at all in this discourse, but that the whole was strictly figurative. It is, indeed, a matter of no very great moment as to which view a man takes, and many will no doubt always hold that there is a reference to the Eucharist in this chapter, while as many will hold the contrary. Neither party will be a whit nearer the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, because of such belief. Indeed, it is a remarkable fact that Protestant doctors, properly so called, should argue for the sacramental allusion; while Papists, who would seem to be more interested in such an application, should, in large numbers, repudiate the connection. But while Protestant writers are thus divided, it by no means at all follows that even those, who consider no reference intended, should themselves not allude to the one, while speaking or writing of the other. For as the phraseology of the Saviour, as recorded by the beloved disciple, tallies with the ordinance, as far as "eating" and "drinking" are concerned, it in no respect seems unsuitable to refer to the evangelist when discoursing on the Holy Supper. This led to the use of the words which express the physical act, when no idea of that is implied, nay, when in the words themselves denied. *Quidam non manducantes, manducant: quidam manducantes, non manducant.* It is not at all strange, therefore, that even those who imagine no reference intended, should quote John vi. as a sanction and support to the Eucharistic celebration. The sentiment of Dr. Claggett is that of sober sense:—"For, as I have already told you, the Eucharist represents the death of Christ, and our spiritual feeding thereupon; and these words in St. John signify what the Eucharist represents. No wonder, therefore, if Christian writers, in speaking of the Eucharist, produce these words, which have so near an affinity with it. And this I think they may do pertinently enough, without supposing that these passages in St. John signify the Eucharist, because they signify some of the same things which the Eucharist signifies."* What we know to be

* See this same author's scarce and valuable "Paraphrase on the Sixth Chapter of John," Appendix I., p. lxxxix.

true of ourselves, we can find no difficulty in believing of the Fathers.

The following authorities, from the early Christian writers, are, for the most part, taken from those collected by the above-named author, whose sensible comments I have allowed to accompany them. They will be found wholly to set aside the pretence that the interpretation put upon John vi. by Archdeacon Wilberforce and others, is supported by "the general judgment of the ancient Church:"*

Clemens Alexandrinus supposes these expressions, to "eat the flesh of Christ," and to "drink His blood," to be as figurative as that of

* I had intended not further to notice, in this second book, the erroneous interpretations of Scripture, and the misappropriations of passages from the Fathers, made in the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." I may, however, here remark, that all reasoning about the impropriety and unusual character of the expressions "eat my flesh" and "drink my blood," to signify "receive my doctrine," is silenced at once by our Lord Himself saying that this was His meaning, "He that cometh to me *shall never hunger*; he that believeth on me *shall never thirst*" (ver. 35). This ought to satisfy and silence Bishop Cleaver, Gesenius, and Archdeacon Wilberforce. And, as neither Ignatius nor Irenæus quotes the words of St. John, it is quite gratuitous, to say the least, to assume that they connect them with the Eucharist in any way.—Doct. H. Euch., p. 168, &c. Hear Dr. Waterland:—"The passage of Ignatius, to which reference is made, is this]: '*Ζῶν γὰρ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἐρῶν τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν· ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται· καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλόϋλον· ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν, καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔσωθέν μοι λέγον· δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· οὐχ ἥδομαι τροφῇ φθορᾶς, οὐδὲ ἡδοναῖς τοῦ βίου τούτου· ἄρτον Θεοῦ θέλω, ἄρτον οὐρανιον, ἄρτον ζωῆς, ὅς ἐστιν σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ υἱοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐν ὑστέρῳ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ πόμα Θεοῦ θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος, καὶ ἀένναος ζωή. Οὐκ ἔτι θέλω κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ζῆν· τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται, ἐὰν ὑμεῖς θελήσητε.*' [Ignat. ad Roman. cap. 7, 8.] 'I am alive at this writing, but my desire is to die. My love is crucified, and I have no secular *fire* left; but there is in me living *water*, speaking to me within, and saying, Come to the Father. I delight not in corruptible food, nor in the entertainments of this world. The bread of God is what I covet; heavenly bread, bread of life—namely, the flesh of Christ Jesus the Son of God, who in these last times became the Son of David and of Abraham; and I am athirst for the drink of God, namely, his blood, which is a feast of love that faileth not, and life everlasting. I have no desire to live any longer among men; neither shall I, if you will but consent.' Upon which Waterland remarks—'Here we may take notice of heavenly bread, bread of God, bread of life, our Lord's own phrases in John vi. And Ignatius understands them of spiritual food, of feeding upon the flesh of Christ, the Son of God incarnate. Drink of God, he interprets in like manner, of the blood of Christ; which is the noblest feast, and life eternal. Learned men have disputed whether he intended what he said of sacramental food, or of celestial; whether of enjoying Christ in the Eucharist, or in heaven. To me it appears a clear point, that he thought not of communicating, but of dying; and that the Eucharist was not the thing which he so earnestly begged to have (for who

St. Paul, "to feed with milk;"* and tells us, upon this occasion, that the word is variously allegorized, being called meat, and flesh, and nourishment, and bread, and blood, and milk; and that "our Lord is all those things for our enjoyment who believe in Him." Now, I am persuaded you will not say that this Father interpreted the words under debate of the Eucharist.

Tertullian, to shew that these words, "the flesh profiteth nothing," do not make against the resurrection of the flesh, saith,† "that we are to be directed to the sense of what is said by the subject matter of it. For because they thought His saying hard and intolerable, as if He intended His flesh should be truly eaten by them; He, to shew that the cause of life and salvation was spiritual, premised this—'that the spirit quickeneth;' and then added, 'the flesh profiteth nothing;' that is, in respect of quickening. And then he shews what He means by the spirit—'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.' As He had said also before, 'He that heareth my words,

would refuse it?), but martyrdom, which the Christians might endeavour to protract, out of an over-officious care for a life so precious.' 'The case is worse with respect to Irenæus, because he manifestly did found his doctrine on 1 Cor. x., 16, and expressly quoted it for that very purpose:—'Vani autem omnimodo, qui . . . carnis salutem negant, et regenerationem ejus spernunt, dicentes, non eam capacem esse incorruptibilitatis. Si autem non salvetur hæc, nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos, neque calix Eucharistiæ communicatio sanguinis ejus est, neque panis quem frangimus, communicatio corporis ejus est.' [Iren. lib. v. cap. 2, p. 293, ed. Bened.] He judged, as every sensible man must, that if the Eucharist, according to St. Paul, amounts to a communion, or communication of our Lord's body and blood to every faithful receiver, that then such receiver, for the time being, is therein considered as symbolically fed with the crucified body, and of consequence entitled to be fellow-heir with the body glorified." Much more may be found in Waterland *in loco.*—Review Doct. Sacr., &c

* *Θὕτως πολλακῶς ἀλληγορεῖται ὁ Λόγος, καὶ βρῶμα, καὶ σὰρξ, καὶ τροφὴ, καὶ ἄρτος, καὶ αἷμα, καὶ γάλα. Ἅπαντα ὁ Κύριος εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν ἡμῶν τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκότων.* Pædag. lib. i., c. 6. p, 105. Paris, [p. 126. Venet. 1757].

† Sic etsi carnem ait nihil prodesse, ex materia dicti dirigendus est sensus. Nam quia durum et intolerabilem existimaverunt sermonem ejus, quasi vere Carnem suam illis edendam determinasset, ut in Spiritum disponeret statum salutis, præmisit. Spiritus est qui vivificat, atque ita subjunxit, Caro nihil prodest, ad vivificandum scilicet. Exequitur etiam quid velit intelligi spiritum. Verba quæ locutus sum vobis, Spiritus sunt, Vita sunt. Sicut et supra, Qui audit sermones meos et credit in eum qui, &c. Itaque Sermonem constituens vivificatorem, quia Spiritus et Vita Sermo, eundem etiam Carnem suam dixit, quia et Sermo Caro erat factus proinde in causam Vitæ appetendus et devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus. Nam et paulo ante Carnem suam Panem quoque cœlestem pronunciarat, urgens usquequaque per allegoriam, &c. Tertul. de Resur. Carnis. c. 36, 37. [p. 347. Par. 1695].

and believeth in him that sent me, hath eternal life, and shall not come into condemnation, but hath passed from death to life.' Therefore, making His word to be the quickening principle: since His word is spirit and life, He called His word also His own flesh; for the Word was also made flesh; and therefore, in order to life, it is to be hungered after, and devoured by *hearing*, and to be chewed again by the *understanding*, and to be digested by *faith*." And afterwards he affirms, that our Lord all along urged His intent by an allegory. So that Tertullian was so far from thinking these passages to refer to the Eucharist, that I am in some doubt whether he understood them with any special reference to the death of Christ.

Origen also interprets flesh and blood in like manner: for, says he, "By the flesh and blood of His *word*, as with pure meat and drink, He refresheth all mankind."* And elsewhere he speaketh to the same purpose."†

St. Athanasius likewise seems to me to be of the same opinion, who, speaking of the literal sense in which the Jews understood our Saviour, hath these words:—"For how could His body suffice for so many to eat of, that it should become nourishment for the whole world? It is," says he, "for this reason that he mentioned the Son of Man's ascending into heaven, that he might draw them off from the corporeal notion."‡ Which testimony, as it manifestly shewed his judgment to be, that our Saviour did not require the proper eating of His natural body: so it contains a very probable argument, that He did not understand those words of eating His sacramental body. For if He had so understood them, it had been very accountable that the body of Christ —*i.e.*, His sacramental body—was sufficient for the nourishment of the whole world. And by removing all corporeal notions of eating and drinking, He seemed to establish only a spiritual notion.

But St. Jerome is plain and full to this purpose, beyond all contradiction, as I am persuaded. For thus he speaks:—"When Jesus saith, 'He that eateth not my flesh, and drinketh not my blood,' although it may be understood in a mystery (*i.e.*, as I think, of the Eucharist), yet the truer sense is, that the body of Christ, and His

* Carnibus enim et sanguine Verbi sui tanquam mundo cibo atque potu reficit omne hominum genus. Orig. in Levit. Hom. 7. [vol. ii., p. 225. col. 2. Par. 1733].

† Vide in Matt. Tract. 12. [Ibid. vol. iii., p. 898. col. 2].

‡ Πόσοις γὰρ ἤρκει τὸ σῶμα πρὸς βρῶσιν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς τοῦτο τροφὴ γένηται; ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναβάσεως ἐμνημόνευσε τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα τῆς σωματικῆς ἐννοίας αὐτοὺς ἀφελκύσῃ, &c. Athan in illud Evangelii, Quicunque dixerit, &c. [vol. i., p. 771. Heidel. 1601].

blood, is the word of the Scriptures—is divine doctrine."* And therefore, he continues, not long after, in this manner: "If, when we hear the word of God—the word of God, and the flesh of Christ, and His blood is poured into our ears, and we think of something else, into how great a danger do we run!" Afterwards comparing it to manna, which was said to give that taste to every man which he liked best: "So," saith he, "in the flesh of Christ, which is the word of doctrine—that is, the interpretation of the holy Scriptures—as we would have it, so we receive food. If thou art holy, here thou findest comfort." St. Jerome could not have been more express, if he had been to maintain this interpretation against an adversary.

Nor does the paraphrase of Eusebius come much behind St. Jerome's interpretation. For he makes our Saviour's explication (ver. 63) to run as if He had said, "Do not think that I speak of that flesh which I carry about me, as if you ought to eat that, or that I command you to drink my sensible and corporeal blood. You well understand that the words which I speak to you are spirit and life. So that," as Eusebius goes on, "His words and doctrines are flesh and blood, of which whoever constantly partakes, he being nourished with heavenly bread, as it were, shall partake of the heavenly life."† He that says this, and knows what he says, could hardly suppose that the Eucharist was particularly intended by our Saviour in these passages.

I shall trouble you with no more instances of this kind, these being sufficient to shew, that all the ancients did not understand those words of the Eucharist. And now I will make no difficulty to grant, that the other opinion is not destitute of all authority, but has the countenance of some Fathers to support it. For we do not pretend to any such

* Quando dicit, Qui non comederit Carnem meam et biberit Sanguinem meum, licet et in mysterio posset intelligi, tamen verius Corpus Christi et Sanguis ejus Sermo Scripturarum est, Doctrina divina est.—Si quando audimus sermonem Dei; Sermo Dei, et caro Christi, et sanguis ejus in auribus nostris funditur, et nos aliud cogitamus, in quantum periculum incurrimus?—Sic et in carne Christi, qui est sermo doctrinæ, hoc est Scripturarum sanctarum interpretatio, sicut volumus ita et cibum accipimus. Hieron. Comment. in Psal. 147. [vol. vii., Append. p. 385. Veron. 1735].

† Μὴ γὰρ τὴν σάρκα ἣν περίκειμαι νομίσατέ με λέγειν, ὡς δέον, αὐτὴν ἐσθίειν, μηδὲ τὸ αἰσθητὸν καὶ σωματικὸν αἷμα πίνειν ὑπολαμβάνετέ με προστάττειν, ἀλλὰ εὖ ἴστε ὅτι τὰ ῥήματά μου ἃ λελάληκα ὑμῖν, πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή ἐστι. ὥστε αὐτὰ εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα. ὧν ὁ μετέχων ἀεὶ, ὡσανεὶ ἄρτῳ οὐρανίῳ τρεφόμενος τῆς οὐρανίου μεθέξει ζωῆς. Euseb. Cæsariensis contra Marcel. de Eccles. Theol. lib. iii., c. 12. [p. 181. Colon. 1688].

privilege of speaking as to say, we have all the Fathers, in a case where we have not every one.

But this I must needs say, that those Fathers, who, as far as I have yet discovered, seem to speak most expressly in favour of the sacramental sense, do not come up to the peremptoriness and clearness of those who are for the spiritual sense.

St. Cyprian, understanding the daily bread which we pray for, not only of common food, but of the Eucharist, applies those words to it: "If any man eateth of this bread, he shall live for ever."* And, says he, "as it is manifest that they who belong to His body (or family), and having a right thereunto, communicate in the Eucharist, do live; so it is to be feared, and we are to pray, lest any of us being excommunicated and separated from the body of Christ, should be far removed from salvation, since Himself uttered this threatening, Except ye eat the flesh, and drink the blood," &c.†

Now, I desire not to make less of these words than they imply. But yet I must say, that St. Cyprian seems, in these and in the foregoing words, which are to the same purpose, to interpret that bread, which he that eateth of shall live for ever, and the flesh and the blood of Christ, not only of the Eucharist, but of all the means of grace that are afforded to His members in the communion of His body; whereof, as he had reason, he thought the Eucharist to be the principal, to which no excommunicated person had right. Not to say that the Eucharist might be here particularly mentioned; because those words, "Except ye eat," &c., have a more clear allusion to the Eucharist than to any other means. Nor am I alone in this interpretation of St. Cyprian; for thus saith Priorius: "The explication of this place is taken from Tertullian, cap. 6. *de Orat.* Therefore, by desiring daily bread, we pray for a perpetual continuance in Christ, and to remain undivided from His body."‡ Thus also Rigaltius upon the place: "The words of God the Father, which Christ in the flesh brought for our salvation, are here to be understood. Therefore, all that time in which Christ lived amongst us in the body, His preaching, His Gospel, is the body and flesh of Christ. It is the cross of Christ, it is the blood of Christ. With this meat and drink, we Christians are nourished to eternal life." By which it is manifest, that Rigaltius did not understand St. Cyprian in that manner, as to abate at all of his judgment, that the spiritual sense of eating and drinking, is to be understood throughout in the sixth of St. John.

* Cypr. de Orat. Dom. [p. 147. Oxon. 1682]. † Qui corpus ejus attingunt. [Ibid].
‡ Notæ in Cypr. Paris. § Observ. Rigalt. in Cypr. Id.

St. Basil is another who applies these words to the sacrament; not where he undertakes to give their proper meaning, but in his moral collections, under the head of receiving the Eucharist; which I do not see but he might do, and yet believe that the spiritual sense of eating and drinking Christ was directly intended. For, as I have already told you, the Eucharist represents the death of Christ, and our spiritual feeding thereupon; and these words in St. John signify what the Eucharist represents. No wonder, therefore, if Christian writers, in speaking of the Eucharist, produce these words, which have so near an affinity with it. And this I think they may do pertinently enough, without supposing that these passages in St. John signify the Eucharist, because they signify some of the same things which the Eucharist signifies.*

St. Augustine, indeed, brings forth that saying, "Except ye eat the flesh," &c. in his disputations against the Pelagians, supposing there, as it should seem, that it was a direct and proper command to receive the Eucharist, under the penalty of damnation; and I remember that, in one place, he urges it for the necessity of communicating infants. But there is this very great prejudice against his authority in this matter, that elsewhere (viz. out of the heat of that controversy) he gives clearly another sense of these words, and speaks of them as if they were reductive only to the Eucharist. Mark, therefore, what He says: "Therefore, by this meat and drink, He would have us to understand the society of His body and members, that is, the holy Church, consisting of His predestinated, and called, and justified, and glorified saints and faithful."† And presently after: "The sacrament of this thing, that is, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, is in some places every day, in other places upon certain days prepared upon the Lord's table, and received from the Lord's table; by some to life, by some to destruction, But the thing itself, of which it is the sacrament, is for life to every man, for destruction to no man, whosoever he be that partakes of it." By which words it is evident that St. Austin did not here understand that eating of the flesh, and drinking of the blood of Christ, to which salvation is promised, of sacramental eating, but of

* Basil. Moral. Reg. 21. [vol. ii. p. 354, 355. Par. 1839.]

† Hunc itaque cibum et potum, societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum suorum, quod est sancta ecclesia in prædestinatis et vocatis, et justificatis, et glorificatis, sanctis, et fidelibus ejus. Hujus rei sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi, alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in Dominica mensa præparatur, et de mensa Dominica sumitur quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium. Res vero ipsa cujus sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicunque ejus particeps fuerit. Aug. Tract. 26, in Johan. [vol. iii. par. 2, p. 500. Par. 1680.]

being incorporated into the invisible Church of Christ; and this because he says, "the sacrament of this thing may be received to destruction;" and because he expressly says, that "this meat and drink is the society of the body of Christ, consisting of His predestinated, &c. members."

And that, therefore, he would not have scrupled to interpret eating by believing; since it is faith by which we are united to the body of Christ, no reasonable man will question. However, we have his own word for it, who, upon that saying of our Saviour, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent," goes on thus, "This, therefore, is to eat that food which perisheth not, but endureth to everlasting life. To what purpose dost thou make ready thy teeth and thy belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten."* Afterwards he puts both together: "Let him come and believe, and be incorporated, that he may be quickened."†

Which words of his are the more remarkable, because in that place he professedly treats of the exposition of this chapter. Where, also, upon that saying, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him," he discourseth thus: "This it is to eat that food, and drink that drink—viz., to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in me. And, therefore, he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, undoubtedly doth not spiritually eat His flesh, nor drink His blood, although he doth carnally and visibly press with his teeth the sacrament of His body and blood; but he rather eats and drinks the sacrament of so great a thing to his condemnation; because, being impure, he hath presumed to come to Christ's sacraments, which none worthily receives who is not pure; of which it is said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.‡" Whence it is manifest that, in St. Austin's judgment, to eat the flesh of Christ, and to drink His blood, was to eat and drink it spiritually, so as good and holy men only do partake thereof, not all that do press the sacrament thereof with their teeth. And it is further observable, that if "to eat

* Hoc est ergo manducare cibum, non qui perit, sed qui permanet in vitam æternam. Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti. In Tract. 25. [Ibid. p. 489.]

† Accedat, credat, incorporetur ut vivificetur. Id. Tract. 26. [p. 499.]

‡ Hoc est manducare escam illam et illum bibere potum, in Christo manere, et illum manentem in me habere. Ac per hoc, qui non manet in Christo et in quo Christus non manet, procul dubio nec manducat spiritualiter carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi, sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit, quia immundus præsumpsit ad Christi accedere sacramenta, quæ aliquis non digne sumit, nisi qui mundus est, &c. Tract. 26 in Joh. [Ibid. p. 501.]

that food and drink that drink" be, as St. Austin says, "to dwell in Christ and to have Christ dwell in us;" then all holy persons do constantly eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, because they still dwell in Christ and Christ in them; but they are not always receiving the sacrament, and therefore St. Austin could not understand these words properly of the Eucharist.

And that these were not sudden notions of his, appears from this, that we find them elsewhere, and particularly in his book of "The City of God," towards the end; which book he finished just before his death. There he hath these words: "for neither are they to be said to eat the body of Christ, because neither are they to be accounted amongst His members. For to omit other things, they cannot be both the members of Christ and the members of an harlot. Lastly, Himself saying, He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him, sheweth what it is to eat the body of Christ and drink His blood, not by the sacrament, but verily and indeed; for this is to dwell in Christ, so as that Christ dwelleth in him."* For His speaking this was as if He had said: "He that dwelleth not in me, and in whom I dwell not, should not say or think that he eateth my flesh or drinketh my blood." Now, the persons here spoken of were Christians of vicious lives, who yet received the sacrament, and continued in the communion of the Church to the last. But since St. Austin, denying that they eat the body of Christ in truth, even when they received the sacrament, does also affirm that Christ spake of receiving His body in truth only when He said, "He that eateth my flesh," &c., it seems evidently to follow that, when St. Austin wrote these passages, he did not understand those places in St. John of sacramental eating. Finally, by comparing this place with the former, it is plain, also, that to eat and drink Christ spiritually, and to eat and drink Him in truth and reality, was, in St. Austin's judgment, all one; and, consequently, that we may really eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood, though we do it not corporeally.

Observe, therefore, these words of his, concerning the general exposi-

* Nec isti ergo dicendi sunt manducare corpus Christi, quoniam nec in membris computandi sunt Christi. Ut enim alia taceam, non possunt simul esse, et membra Christi, et membra meretricis. Denique ipse dicens, qui manducat carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet, et ego in eo: ostendit quid sit non sacramento tenus, sed revera corpus Christi manducare et ejus sanguinem bibere; hoc est enim in Christo manere, ut in illo maneat et Christus. Sic enim hoc dicit tanquam diceret, qui non in me manet, et in quo ego non maneo, non se dicat aut existimet manducare corpus meum, aut bibere sanguinem meum. De Civit. Dei, lib. xxi., c. 25. [vol. vii., p. 646. Par. 1685.]

tion of Scripture phrases: "If the saying be preceptive, either forbidding a wicked action, or commanding to do that which is good, it is no figurative saying. But if it seems to command any villainy or wickedness, or to forbid what is profitable and good, it is figurative. This saying, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you, seems to command a villanous or wicked thing. It is, therefore, a *figure*, enjoining us to communicate in the passion of our Lord, and to lay it up in dear and profitable remembrance, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for our sakes."*

When we are thus told that "the sixth chapter of St. John is referred to the Eucharist by ancient writers, and by all the earliest commentators on Scripture," we withhold our assent; and, notwithstanding that Chrysostom and Cyril Alexandrinus† do so interpret it; yet this really makes but little, if anything, for the Church of Rome. The *figurative* nature of the discourse still remains, and demonstrably so; as the words, taken literally (as Romish writers sometimes persuade us they take them), teach us, as before remarked, impanation, and not transubstantiation. The change indicated, if it be a change, is in the wrong direction for our opponents. Nor do the words of Chrysostom, which are quoted on page 176 of the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," create any difficulty. For no question it cannot be said of Christ's flesh *absolutely*, that it is of no profit. "How can it be said that the flesh profiteth nothing, without which we cannot live?" inquires that Father; and adds,—"You see that the words, 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' are not spoken of His flesh, but of hearing Him in a fleshly manner." Doubtless, to assert that the flesh of Christ profiteth nothing, would be to make the Incarnation a nullity. It

* Si præceptiva est locutio, aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, aut beneficentiam jubens, non est figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem filii hominis et sanguinem biberitis, vitam in vobis non habebitis, facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere; figura ergo est præcipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter in memoria recondendum, quod caro ejus pro nobis crucifixa et vulnerata sit. De Doctrina Christiana, lib. iii., c. 16. [vol. iii., par. 1, p. 52. Par. 1680.]

† It cannot be truly asserted, as by Mr. Wilberforce, that Augustine explained this chapter with special reference to the Eucharist, notwithstanding an occasional allusion to it. See his commentary on it, Appendix H., p. lxxxiii.

is through *that*, that the blessings of life and immortality have been secured to the Church. In his commentary on the same verse, St. Augustine makes similar remarks; but more plainly than does Chrysostom. The words of the bishop of Hippo are:

"For if the flesh profiteth nothing, the Word had not been made flesh, that it might dwell in us. If, by means of the flesh, Christ hath much profited us, how profiteth the flesh nothing? But the flesh was the means whereby the spirit acted for our salvation. The flesh was a vessel: mark what it had, not what it was. The apostles were sent: did their flesh nothing profit us? If the flesh of the apostles profited us, can it be that the flesh of the Lord profited nothing? For whence came to us the sound of the Word but by the voice of the flesh? Whence the pen of the writer, whence the writing? These all are works of the flesh, but by the spirit actuating, as one may say, His organ. 'It is the spirit,' then, 'that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing:' so as those Jews understood the flesh, not so give I my flesh to be eaten."

The next passage to which I shall refer is that of St. Paul, in the tenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians:

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What say I then? that the idol is any thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than He?"*

* These verses are somewhat differently rendered by Waterland, for the reason assigned. "Ver. 16. 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? 17. For since the bread is one, we, being many, are one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread. 18. Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they who eat of the sacrifices communicants of the altar? 19. What say I, then? that the idol is anything, or that what is offered in sacrifice to the idol is anything? 20. But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not have you become communicants of devils. 21. You cannot

Now, while we refuse to acknowledge that the apostle meant here to inculcate the reception of Christ's natural flesh and blood, whether *naturally* or *sacramentally*, in the Eucharist, we do imagine that he meant much more than many Protestants believe. There is great danger in sinking the meaning of Scripture too low, as well as in raising it too high—in making it mean too little, as in attributing to it too much. "Some interpret communion here," says Waterland, "to mean no more than a joint partaking of the outward signs, symbols, or memorials, of Christ's body and blood. But St. Paul must undoubtedly mean a great deal more, by his emphatical expressions; and his argument also requires it, as shall be shewn in due place. He does not say, that the service is a commemoration of Christ's body and blood, but a partaking or communion of them. So, likewise, with respect to the Jews, he does not say that they commemorated the altar, but they were partakers of the altar: and the idolaters whom he speaks of did not barely commemorate devils (if they did it at all), but they were partakers of devils. Besides, to interpret the communion as a joint partaking of the symbols, or memorials, is inventing a sense too flat and jejune to be fathered upon the apostle; for, indeed, it is mere tautology. It is no more than saying, that partaking of the bread and wine is partaking of the bread and wine. There is good sense in saying, that the partaking of one thing is, in just construction, the partaking of some other thing:

drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: you cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils.' I have varied a little from the common rendering, partly for better answering the difference of phrase in the Greek, between μετέχειν and κοινωνεῖν (be they equivalent or otherwise), and partly for the better expressing the three communions, here brought in as corresponding to each other in the analogy; namely, that of Christ's body and blood in the first place; next, that of the Jewish altar; and lastly, of devils. Our translation has, in some measure, obscured the analogy, by choosing, in one place, the word partakers (though it means the same thing) instead of communicants; and, in another place, by saying communion *with* devils, instead of saying *of* devils: κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων, v. 20." Dr. Waterland adds in a note,—"In strictness, μετέχειν signifies the taking a part or parcel of anything, with others, who have likewise their separate shares or parcels of it; but κοινωνεῖν is the partaking with others, in common, of the same whole, undivided thing.

but to make all sign, and nothing signified, or to reckon the outward signs twice over, dropping the inward things signified, is unsuitable to the turn of the whole passage, and entirely defeats the apostle's argument. The eating of the sacrifices was not again mere eating of sacrifices, but it was, by interpretation, communicating with idolators; and communicating with idolaters was not again communicating with idolaters, but it was, in just construction, partaking of devils. Thus we find strong and admirable sense in the apostle's discourse; but in the other way all is dull and insipid. Take we the next parallel instance: the joint partaking of the Jewish sacrifices was not again the joint partaking of the same sacrifices; but it was partaking of the altar, whatever that means. In like manner, a joint partaking of the symbols or memorials of bread and wine is not again a joint partaking of the same symbols or memorials, but of something else (by the apostle's argument) which they represent, and call to our mind, and which, in just construction, or in effect, they are. Had St. Paul meant only, that the bread which we break is the joint eating of the bread, and the cup which we bless is the joint drinking of the cup, why should he have changed the terms bread and cup into other terms, body and blood, instead of using the same over again? Or if body and blood mean only bread and cup, then see what sense can be made of chap. xi. 27, which must run thus: Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the bread and cup of the Lord. It is not using an inspired apostle with any proper respect, to put such an odd (not to say ridiculous) sense upon him. The case is plain, that the four terms, bread, wine, body, and blood, have severally their respective meanings, and that the first two express the signs, to which the other two answer as things signified; and so all is right. Add to this, that the eating and drinking in the Eucharist, upon the foot of the other construction, would be rendered insignificant; for the breaking of the bread, and the pouring out of the wine, would be sufficient for a bare representation or memorial of our Lord's death. The feeding thereupon adds

nothing to the representation, but must either signify our receiving something spiritual under that corporeal symbol, or signify nothing. And it would appear very strange, if the feeding itself should not be symbolical, some way or other, as well as the rest; especially considering that other places of Scripture (particularly John vi.), do insist very much upon spiritual feeding, and that the quantity of meat and drink in the Eucharist has all along been so small, that it might be difficult to say what use it could be of as a banquet, unless allowed to be significative or symbolical of some spiritual entertainment received by the communicants. Upon the whole, this interpretation must be rejected, as being altogether low and lame; or, rather, totally repugnant to all the circumstances of text and context."

The following remarks of Dr. Pelling, on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, go far towards elucidating the full import of the words, "partakers of the altar," and their application to the Eucharist:

"But, in my opinion, St. Paul hath said enough to this purpose, if men will but attentively listen to what he saith in 1 Cor. x., where part of his business is to shew how unlawful it is for Christians to eat of things that are offered unto idols. And this he doth by shewing the incongruity and inconsistency of the thing, and the evil effects of it; because every professor of Christianity doth hereby make himself a most wretched bankrupt, and undoes all his interest in Christ, and throws away an inestimable stock and treasure of blessings by his sitting at meat in the idol's temple. To make this out he shews, in few words, what those blessings are: 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' (ver. 16), where part of the apostle's meaning is this,—that by rightly receiving the symbols of Christ's body and blood, we have a share in all those blessings for which His body was broken and His blood was shed. We have a title, claim, and right thereby to all the mercies of the new covenant; we receive the virtues and wonderful effects of His passion, and so we are understood, in a mystical sense, to participate of Christ's body and blood. It is true we do here partake of Christ, not mystically only, but really too; we participate not only of His bruised and crucified, but also of His most blessed and glorified body, as I shall shew

at large hereafter in its proper place; but that is not to our purpose now. Though we do communicate of Christ now, while He is in heaven, yet, in the place before quoted, St. Paul doth directly point to those blessings which, by means of this sacrament, accrue to us from His sufferings on the cross. And to convince us that we do hereby receive many such blessings, and that we are entitled to the love and favour of God in particular (which is the fountain and original of all other blessings); to convince us of this, I say, he draws a parallel between this sacrificial feast of ours and those others which were used among the Jews. Behold Israel after the flesh, saith he; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?* That is, do they not partake of those sacrifices which are offered upon the altar? His plain meaning is, that the Jews did partake of those effects which, by the sacrifices, were procured; their feasting upon the sacrifices was a token and pledge to them, that their desires were answered; that what they had offered and sacrificed for was granted them; that their oblations returned into their own bosom, that they had the benefit of them, and were entitled to those blessings which they were intended for. There is an expression which will make this matter clear, in Lev. vii., 18: "If any of the flesh of the sacrifice of His peace-offerings be eaten at all on the third day, it shall not be accepted; neither shall it be imputed unto him that offereth it. When those sacrificial feasts were regularly celebrated, they were imputed to the guests for their good, they were reckoned advantageous to them, they were favourably accepted at God's hand in order to the ends for which the sacrifice was designed, they served to make an atonement, they were effectual to their purposes, they were good to all intents, they were available to the offerers (as the Hebrew doctors expound the phrase).† This is the true meaning of being partakers of the altar, in St. Paul's language; when, by eating duly of the sacrifices of the altar, they turned to a good account, and men were profited, benefited, and blessed by so doing, being in communion with God (whose altar it was), and receiving the pledges of His favour, which was obtained by the things that were offered upon the altar. Was the grace of God to be begged and sought for by an holocaust? Why, eating of the oblations, which were annexed to it, was a pledge to assure them that their prayer was heard, and that God would be gracious unto them. Was the wrath of God to be appeased by a sin-offering? Why, the feeding upon those oblations, which attended it, was appointed as a pledge to certify them, that an atonement was made. Were peace-offerings presented, that people might

* Clarius in Loc. † Ainsworth on Lev. xvii., 18.

be delivered from dangers and ill changes, and that God would give them peace, prosperity, and plenty, and continue his goodness to them? Why, the feasting upon the peace-offerings was intended as a pledge to satisfy them; that God's good providence and care of them should not be wanting, as long as they would not be wanting to themselves. Thus they were partakers of the altar, by being assured of the effects of their offerings.

"To return now to our apostle's argument: As the Jews were partakers of God's altar, so are we partakers of the Lord's table. Their sacrificial feasts were intended as pledges of God's manifold mercies to them; and this Christian feast is intended as a pledge of God's manifold mercies to us, but to better purposes, and in a far higher degree. God covenanted with them for things temporal; with us He covenants for spiritual and heavenly things chiefly. Christ, our sacrifice, was slain, to purge our very consciences from sin; to endue us with the Holy Ghost; and with power, from on high, to deliver us from the danger of eternal damnation; to make us sure of heaven, and to make God and us one. And this, our sacrificial feast, is intended as a pledge to certify and assure us, that his friendship and dearest love shall never fail us, if we be but true friends to our own souls Thus we partake and communicate of our Saviour's body that was crucified, and of the streams of that blood He shed for us, by receiving at this sacrament the virtues and effects of His passion, as the Jews received the virtues and effects of their sacrifices. This sacrament is a token to us, that Christ's sacrifice is imputed to us (in a comfortable sense)—that is, here God assures all faithful communicants, and, as it were, sets His seal to it, that Christ's offering up Himself shall infallibly turn to a good account to them, that it is an effectual atonement on their behalf; that it shall be available for them to all intents and purposes; and that, though they do not eat of the very flesh of our sacrifice, as the Jews did of their peace-offerings, but of bread in the room of it, yet it shall be all one to them in effect, and that they shall ever be the blessed of the Lord.

"I have been the more prolix and exact in this matter, that I might clear and vindicate the doctrine of the Church of England, whose notion of a sacrament in general is this, that it is an outward and visible sign, ordained as a means whereby we receive, and as a pledge to assure us of, an inward and spiritual grace. And of this sacrament in particular the faith, that Christ hath instituted and ordained these holy mysteries as pledges of His love; and that God doth assure us thereby of His favour and goodness towards us. For it is senseless to imagine, that Christ should intend the absolution of so many Mosaical rites,

because they would be useless and insignificant, or of very small account under the Gospel, and yet should institute Himself another ceremony, that would be of very mean and inconsiderable importance."

We see here not only what is the sense of the apostle, but also the benefits which pious communicants receive from being partakers of the Christian altar. It appears to me that Waterland rightly enunciates the true doctrine of this passage, when he says, "The Eucharist, in its primary intention, and in its certain effect to all worthy communicants, is a communion of Christ's body broken, and blood shed; that is to say, a present partaking of, or having a part in, our Lord's passion, and the reconcilement therein made, and the blessed fruits of it. This is plain good sense, and undeniable truth. . . . It is observable, that St. Paul (his own best interpreter), instead of saying, Ye do shew the Lord's body and blood, broken and shed, says, 'Ye do shew the Lord's death till He come.' Which makes it plain, that body broken, and blood shed, are, in this case, equivalent to the single word death, with its fruits; and that is the thing signified in our sacramental service. And if that be the thing signified, it is that which we partake of, or spiritually receive: and we are in this sacrament ingrafted, as it were, into the death of Christ, in much the same sense, and to the same effect, as in the other sacrament we are said to be 'baptized into his death,' and 'planted together in the likeness of his death.' All the difference is, that the same thing is represented and exhibited, here and there, under different signs or symbols."

I shall give but one other quotation, to shew the sense of our own divines on this passage, which I take from Waterland, the original not being within my reach at present. It is from Locke's commentary on the text, and is as follows:—"They who drink of the cup of blessing, which we bless in the Lord's Supper, do they not therefore partake of the benefits purchased by Christ's blood, shed for them upon the cross, which they here symbolically drink? and they who eat of the bread broken there, do they not partake in the sacrifice of the body of Christ, and strengthen their

union with Him, as members of Him, their head? For by eating of that bread, we, though many in number, are all united, and make but one body under Christ, our head, as many grains of corn are united into one loaf. See how it is among the Jews, who are outwardly, according to the flesh, by circumcision the people of God. Among them, they who eat of the sacrifice are partakers of God's table, the altar; have fellowship with Him, and share in the benefit of the sacrifice, as if it were offered for them. Do not mistake me, as if I hereby said, that the idols of the Gentiles are gods in reality, or that the things offered to them change their nature, and are anything really different from what they were before, so as to affect us in our use of them. No; but this I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that you should have fellowship with, and be under the influence of devils, as they who, by eating of things offered to them, enter into covenant, alliance, and commerce with them. You cannot eat and drink with God, as friends at His table in the Eucharist, and entertain familiarity and friendship with devils, by eating with them, and partaking of the sacrifices offered to them."

The next passage to which I shall refer, and the last, is that of the apostle Paul, in 1 Cor. xi., 20 to 29. It is as follows:

"When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say unto you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which He was betrayed took bread: and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily,

shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

Now, this whole passage is most important, not only as giving us another and independent account of the institution, but also as affording us an insight into the conduct of one of the most important early Christian Churches, its abuse of the most solemn rite of our holy religion, the tone and style of rebuke adopted by the apostle, and an exposition of his own views of the significance of the Eucharistic observance. It will be found that we should seek herein in vain for Popish doctrine, while, without any question, the apostle's idea is not that of *mere* memorial: the true view in this, as in most other cases, lying midway between the extremes of superstition and profanity.

There is but little to remark upon in this passage as concerning the controversy, till we come to the twenty-sixth verse. Upon this is built, not only the legitimate conclusion that the Eucharist is a *commemorative* ordinance, but, what by no means follows, that it is nothing more. It is not necessary to go over the ground already traversed, in which it has been shewn that the ordinance is, and was intended to be, much more than commemorative. The phraseology, moreover, of the following verses in this place prove the same point, though not at all what the Romish school would deduce from it.

The latter part of the twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth verses is that which is chiefly depended upon by the advocates of a *corporeal* presence, as proving their point. In the former the apostle says, "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, *shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.*" Now, it is manifest that this passage must be explained by whatever sense has already been proved to belong to the words of institution, "this is my body;" for whatever guilt is incurred respecting the "unworthy" use of the things signified by the symbols, can be in no other sense than

that in which the body and blood are present. So also respecting the twenty-ninth verse: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, *not discerning the Lord's body.*" Now, this *discerning* can have no reference to aught of a physical nature; for the most strenuous advocates of a corporeal presence, do not argue that the body and blood are visible; so that the *discerning* must be a mental act. This passage, therefore, really need not be considered in the controversy, as far as the advocates of a corporeal presence are concerned; for the question is not upon the mode of discerning, which they, as well as we, admit to be spiritual or mental; and that as to the mode of presence is untouched in it. Such, however, is not the case on the other side. Here we have confessedly a passage in which the *discerning* the Lord's body is used in a spiritual sense, which forms a strong argument for the spiritual nature of the presence. I do not say that it is conclusive; but I do say, that there is in it a strong presumptive evidence against the alleged corporeal presence; for what is more natural than that the mode of presence, and the mode of *discerning* it, should be the same? The former passage, however, will require a few remarks, in order that we may understand the expression, "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord."

In considering, then, the sense of the words, "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," we must inquire, whether or not any other similar expressions are found, from which we may, probably, gather the sense of the apostle. Now, not to dwell upon the manifest truism, that religious privileges and advantages, when not only neglected but *abused*, become cases of aggravated condemnation to those concerned therein;—not to linger upon such expressions as those used of and to ancient Israel:—"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts? Bring no

more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear; your hands are full of blood." Not to dwell, I say, on such passages as these in the Old Testament—and with such denunciations the prophets are full — there are many in the writings of St. Paul which go *directly* to illustrate the expression in question. For instance, the apostle, when referring to those who had enjoyed great spiritual privileges, "who were once enlightened, had tasted of the heavenly gift, were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and had tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come;" of such he says, "if they shall fall away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing *they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh*, and put him to an open shame" (Heb. vi., 4, 5, 6): where it is plain that the persons alluded to "are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," hardly in another sense, though undoubtedly in another manner than those who nailed Him to the cross on Calvary—hardly in any other sense or manner than those referred to in Heb. xi., 27, of whom the words were immediately spoken. So again, the same inspired writer, comparing the guilt and punishment of those who sin against the light of the Gospel dispensation, with the guilt and punishment of those who sinned under the Mosaic economy (which is just what we called a *truism* above), shews that responsibilities increase in proportion to opportunities. "Of how much sorer punishment, think ye," says the apostle, "shall he be thought worthy w*ho hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing?*" Is not this language perfectly equivalent to saying, that such "are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord?" It is manifest that the idea is, in both phrases, the same: indeed, the phraseology itself is scarcely different.

The sense of all these passages is sufficiently evident. It is a sin of no light character *to neglect* opportunities of improvement; but how much more heinous must it be to abuse the means of grace afforded, and to turn them into occasions of greater sin? "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you," is an injunction of the Saviour Himself. If it be wrong to afford even the opportunity of such abuse, how much more fearfully so to be the perpetrator thereof. Tyre and Sidon, Chorazin and Bethsaida, were, in consequence of superior privileges, declared by the lips of infallible Truth, liable to a more terrific fate than fell to the lot of Sodom and Gomorrah. "If I had not done among you the works which no other man did, you had not had sin," are words consistent at once with reason, and other parts of divine revelation.

I feel that it is unnecessary to go at greater length into the investigation of this subject. The several parts of the inspired volume are at unity with themselves. The same doctrine pervades the whole, whether under different forms, or conveyed in varied phraseology. The Bible, under the old economy, never presented any observances of a magical character, or of supernatural operation; and certainly, under the New Testament, gives no unmeaning, no uninfluential rites for Christian men's observance. But if the paschal supper had in it something more than a mere memorial of the past, shall we not look for something more, likewise, in that which has taken its place in the more perfect economy? I shall bring this chapter to a close with an enumeration of the chief points of resemblance between the passover and the Eucharist, taken from Waterland's valuable treatise.

The resembling circumstances common to the Jewish and Christian Passover may be divided into two kinds: some relating to the things themselves, some to the phrases and forms made use of here and there.

I. Of the first sort are these: 1. The passover was of divine

appointment, and so is the Eucharist. 2. The passover was a sacrament, and so is the Eucharist. 3. The passover was a memorial of a great deliverance from temporal bondage;* the Eucharist is a memorial of a great deliverance from spiritual bondage. 4. The passover prefigured the death of Christ† before it was accomplished; the Eucharist represents or figures out our Lord's death now past. 5. The passover was a kind of federal rite between God and man; so also is the Eucharist. 6. As no one was to eat of the passover before he had been circumcised,‡ so no one is to partake of the Eucharist before he has been baptized. 7. As the Jews were obliged to come clean to the passover,§ so are Christians obliged to come well prepared to the communion.‖ 8. As slight defilements (where there was no contempt) did not debar a man from the passover, nor excuse his neglect of it,¶ so neither do smaller offences, where there is an honest heart, either forbid or excuse a man's absenting himself from this sacrament. 9. As a total contempt or neglect of the passover was crime great enough to render the offender liable to be "cut off from Israel;"** so a total contempt or neglect of the holy communion is in effect to be cut off from Christianity. 10. As the passover was to continue as long as the Jewish law should stand in force, so must the Eucharist abide as long as Christianity.††

II. The other sort of resembling circumstances concern the particular forms and phrases made use of in the institution: and it is in these chiefly that the great masters of Jewish antiquities have obliged the Christian world. I shall offer a short summary of these likewise.

1. In the paschal, the master of the house took bread and blessed it in a prayer of thanksgiving to God: and the rule was, never to begin the blessing till he had the bread in hand, that so

* Exod. xii. 14; xiii. 9; Deut. xvi. 3.
† Vid. Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. tom. 1. lib. 2. cap. 9. p. 415, &c.
‡ Exod. xii., 43—48. § Num. ix., 6. ‖ 1 Cor. xi., 27, 28, 29.
¶ Num. ix. 10; 2 Chron. xxx., 18.
** Exod. xii., 15; Num. ix., 13; Confer. Bucher. Antiqu. p. 402.
†† 1 Cor. xi., 26.

the prayer of benediction directed to God, might at the same time be understood to have relation to the bread, and might draw down a blessing upon it.* It is obvious to see how applicable all this is to our Lord's conduct in the first article of the institution.

2. The breaking of the bread, after benediction, was a customary practice in the Jewish feasts :† only in the paschal feast, it is said, that the bread was first broken and the benediction followed.‡

3. The distributing the bread to the company, after the benediction and fraction, was customary among the Jews :§ and here likewise our Lord was pleased to adopt the like ceremony.

Several learned men have suggested,‖ that the words, "This is my body," might be illustrated from some old Jewish forms made use of in the passover feast; as, "This is the bread of affliction," &c., and, "This is the body of the passover :" but Buxtorf thought them not pertinent, or not early enough to answer the purpose :¶ and Bucherus,** who has carefully re-examined the same, passes the like doubtful judgment; or rather rejects both the instances as improper, not being found among the Jewish rituals, or being too late to come into account.

4. The words, "This do in remembrance of me," making part of the institution, are reasonably judged to allude to the ancient paschal solemnities, in which were several memorials :†† and the service itself is more than once called a memorial in the Old Testament, as before noted.

* See Pfaffius de Oblat. vet. Eucharist. p. 171, &c. Bucherus, Antiq. Evangel. p. 368, &c. Buxtorf. de Cœna Domini, p. 310.

† Buxtorf. 313; Bucherus, 372.

‡ Lightfoot, Temple Service, c. xiii. sec. 7. p. 964. and on Matt. xxvi., 26. p. 259. Pfaffius, p. 178.

§ Buxtorf. 316; Bucherus, 374.

‖ See particularly Pfaffius de Oblat. p. 179. And Deylingius, (Miscellan. Sacr. p. 228, &c.) who refers to such authors as have espoused the first of the instances, after Baronius and Scaliger.

¶ Buxtorf. Dissert. vi., de Cœna, p. 301. Dissert. vii. Vindic. p. 347, 348.

** Bucherus, Antiq. Evangel. p. 375, Compare Deylingius (Miscellan. Sacr. p. 228, &c.), who absolutely rejects one and doubts of the other.

†† Ἀνάμνησις ritus Hebræorum redolet: habebant namque Judæi, in celebratione agni paschalis, plures ejusmodi ἀναμνήσεις et recordationes, &c. Bucherus, p. 370.

5. In the ancient paschal feast, the master of the house was wont to take cup after cup (to the number of four) into his hands, consecrating them, one after another, by a short thanksgiving; after which each consecrated cup was called a cup of blessing.

6. At the institution of the passover it was said, "The blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where you are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you,"* &c. The blood was the token of the covenant in that behalf, between God and His people; as circumcision before had been a token also of a like covenant,† and called covenant as well as token.‡ In the institution of the communion, our Lord says, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is shed for you, for many, for the remission of sins." The cup is here by a figure put for wine; and covenant, according to ancient Scripture phrase, is put for token of a covenant; and wine, representative of Christ's blood, answers to the blood of the passover, typical of the same blood of Christ:§ and the remission of sins here, answers to the passing over there, and preserving from plague. These short hints may suffice just to intimate the analogy between the Jewish passover and the Christian Eucharist in the several particulars of moment here mentioned.

7. At the paschal feast there was an annunciation, or declaration of the great things which God had done for that people;‖ in like manner, one design of the Eucharist is to make a declaration

* Exod. xii., 13.

† Gen. xvii., 11.

‡ Gen. xvii., 10, "This is my covenant," &c.; and v. 13, "My covenant shall be in your flesh," &c.

§ Deus speciali mandato sacrificia et primitias offerendas ordinavit, maxime effusionem sanguinis, ut ab initio homines haberent unde effusionis per Christum tacite recordari possent: (Dan. ix., 24; Heb. ix. et x.; Rom. iii.) Præter cæteras oblationes Deo factas, commemorabilia sunt sacrificia in festo expiationum.——Tum quoque sacrificium agni paschalis, et quotidiani, seu jugis sacrificii, attendi debit. Hos igitur ad ritus et oblationes alludit Christus cum ait, Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Observant præterea viri docti vinum rufum, quale in illis regionibus crescebat, ac in primis in cœna paschali bibebatur, egregiam nobis sanguinis memoriam relinquere. Bucher. Antiq. Evan. p. 389.

‖ See Lightfoot, vol. ii. p. 778. Pfaffius, p. 181.

of the mercies of God in Christ, to "shew the Lord's death till He come."

8. Lastly, at the close of the paschal supper, they were wont to sing an hymn of praise :* and the like was observed in the close of the institution of the Christian Eucharist, as is recorded in the Gospels.

* See Lightfoot, vol. ii. p. 258, 260. Pfaffius, p. 181.

CHAPTER III.

TESTIMONIES IN ALL CENTURIES, FROM THE FIFTH TO THE FIFTEENTH, IN FAVOUR OF THE PROTESTANT VIEW OF THE EUCHARIST.

I HAVE already considered the positive testimony of Scripture on the subject of our enquiry, and also illustrated the views of the early Church, in numberless quotations from their writings. It has been seen, that with whatever of figure and hyperbole the ancient Greek and Latin Fathers sometimes spoke and wrote, when pouring forth their souls in fervid declamation, or indulging in oratorical displays, yet, in their more sober and systematic statements, they speak the language of reason and scriptural truth. This is the case for the first eight centuries of the Christian era; for, however far some may have gone in the use of language which must be considered unguarded, yet in the same authors, during the period mentioned, we always find the corrected statement of sobriety. It is not in isolated expressions, and disjointed sentences, that the opinions of the Fathers must be sought, but in their whole train of thought, and the general drift of their writings. When they are thus examined, they are found generally to hold the great distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel, and become powerful witnesses of the truth of Protestant Christianity against the unscriptural heresies of the Vatican and Trent.

It would be but a waste of time to go over the ground which has thus been trodden, as far as, at least, the first five centuries are concerned. I shall now proceed to prove, that in every succeeding age, downwards to the Reformation, there was the profession of Protestant doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist; and

that when, in the ninth century, Paschasius began to teach the before unheard-of doctrine of transubstantiation, he was strenuously opposed by both clergy and laity. It is impossible not to see the weight of this testimony, which is indeed the most weighty and cumulative which can be brought to bear on any doctrine. Thus, with regard to this leading doctrine of the Romish communion, there is, in the first nine centuries of the Christian era, the absence of all special instruction as to a corporeal presence, of all particular directions for worship, &c., arising necessarily from that doctrine, and of all objections to it by adversaries of any kind. But as soon as Paschasius begins to preach it, opposition is rife enough; and no sooner is it adopted as an article of faith, than it is specifically taught, though at first with such varying phraseology as shews the doctrine to be unsettled; while directions are liberally dispensed to regulate the conduct of all who believed in such a momentous tenet. The conduct of both Papist and Protestant (to forestall the names) since the ninth century, being so different from what it was previously, can only be explained by the assumption that both now occupy a position which they did not before that time.

Before parting company with the Augustine age, I will give a quotation or two from Theodoret, bishop of Cyr, or Cyrus, in Syria. From these it will be perceived that, however clear and emphatic the Protestant doctrine of those Fathers is, it is only *fully* seen and felt from a consideration of the whole of the passages. Pick some particular sentence, and the sense may be made to appear very different from what it really is, and what the writer intended. These passages are from Theodoret's Dialogues, in which he introduces an orthodox believer and a Eutychian discoursing thus:

Dial. 1. "*Orthodoxus.* Do you not know that God called His body bread?—*Eranistes.* I know it.—*Orth.* Elsewhere also He calleth His flesh wheat.—*Eran.* I know that also: Unless a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, &c.—*Orth.* But in the delivery of the mysteries, He called the bread His body, and that which is mixed

(viz., wine and water in the cup) blood.—*Eran.* He did so call them. —*Orth.* But that which is His body by nature (*κατὰ φύσιν τὸ σῶμα*) is also to be called His body, and His blood (viz., by nature) blood.—*Eran.* It is confessed.—*Orth.* But our Saviour changed the names,* and on His body he imposed the name of the symbol (or sign), and on the symbol He put the name of His body; and so having called Himself a vine, He called the symbol blood.—*Eran.* Very right. But I have a mind to know the reason of this change of names.—*Orth.* The scope is manifest to those that are initiated in divine things. For† He would have those that participate the divine mysteries not to attend to the nature of those things that are seen, but upon the changing of the names to believe the change that is made by grace. For He that called His body, that is so by nature, wheat and bread, and again termed Himself a vine,‡ He honoured the visible symbols with the appellation of His body and blood, not altering nature, but to nature adding grace."

Proceed we now to the next dialogue.

Dial. 2. "*Orth.* The mystical symbols offered to God by the priests, pray tell me what are they signs of?—*Eran.* Of the Lord's body and blood.—*Orth.* Of His body truly or not truly such?—*Eran.* Of that which is truly (His body.)—*Orth.* Very right. For there must be an original of an image (*τῆς εἰκόνος ἀρχέτυπον*), for painters imitate nature and draw the images of visible things.—*Eran.* True.—*Orth.* If, then, the divine mysteries are antitypes of a true body, then the Lord's body is a true body still, not changed into the nature of the Deity, but filled with divine glory.§—*Eran.* You have seasonably brought in the discourse of the divine mysteries; for thereby I will shew that the Lord's body is changed into another nature. Answer, therefore, my question.—*Orth.* I will.—*Eran.* What call ye the gift that is offered before the priest's invocation?—*Orth.* I may not openly declare it, for perhaps some here present may not be initiated.—*Eran.* Answer, then, enigmatically.—*Orth.* I call it the food that is made of a certain grain.—*Eran.* How call you the other symbol?—*Orth.* By a common name, that signifies a kind of drink.—*Eran.* But how do

* Τῷ μὲν σώματι τὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα, τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ τὸ τοῦ σώματος. [vol. iv., p. 26. Hal. 1772].

† Μὴ τῇ φύσει τῶν βλεπομένων προσέχειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀναλλαγῆς, πιστεύειν τῇ ἐκ τῆς χάριτος γεγενημένῃ μεταβολῇ. [Ibid.]

‡ Οὗτος τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθεικώς. [Ibid.]

§ Τοῦ ὄντος σώματος ἀντίτυπα. [Ibid., p. 125].

you call it after consecration?—*Orth.* The body of Christ, and the blood of Christ.—*Eran.* And do you believe you partake the body and blood of Christ?—*Orth.* Yes, I believe it.—*Eran.* As then the symbols of Christ's body and blood are one thing before the priest's invocation, but after the invocation are changed, and become another thing; so the Lord's body, after His assumption, is changed into a divine essence.—*Orth.* You are caught in a net of your own weaving. For after sanctification the mystical symbols do not depart from their own nature;* for they remain still in their former substance, and figure and form, and may be seen and touched just as before. But they are understood to be that which they are made, and are believed and venerated, as being those things they are believed to be."

Now, this is language of the most decided character as to the opinions entertained by the Church in the fifth century. The contradiction to the doctrine of the modern Church of Rome is verbally explicit—"not altering nature, but adding grace to nature," is what we all should be willing to acknowledge. We believe, with Theodoret, that after consecration, "the mystical symbols do not depart from their own nature, for they remain still in their former substance, figure, and form." No allusion to what they are considered to become sacramentally could, for one moment, put the sense of such clear and consistent declarations as the preceding in the least degree in doubt. It is evident enough to what church Theodoret would belong, if he were to come back to earth in this age. It is important to remark, that the whole force of the argument here, in the mouth of the orthodox, depends upon the assumption that there was no transubstantiation.

In the sixth century Fulgentius,† speaking of the Eucharist, says, "In this sacrifice there is a thanksgiving and remembrance of the flesh which He offered, and the blood which Christ shed for us;" and "this sacrifice of bread and wine was offered throughout

* Οὐ γὰρ κατὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· Μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἴδους, καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι, καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. Νοεῖται δὲ ἅπερ ἐγένετο, καὶ πιστεύεται καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται. [Ibid., p. 126].

† In isto sacrificio gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis Christi, quam pro nobis obtulit. Augustin. de fide ad Petr. Diacon. cap. 19.

the whole Catholic Church."* This does not look much like transubstantiation. The Eucharist is called very properly *a remembrance* of Christ's flesh, and a "sacrifice of bread and wine:" such language would be deemed heretical by the Church of Rome to-day.

Primasius and Gaudentius both call this sacrament "a *pignus*, pledge of the presence of Christ now absent from us." Facundus, Bishop of Hermiana, in Africa, says plainly, "The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, which is in the bread and cup, we call His body and blood *non quod proprie ;*† not that it is properly His body and blood, but because it containeth a mystery of His body and blood." How could Facundus have inserted the saving clause if he had believed as does the modern Church of Rome? Every explanation given now is in the opposite direction,—viz., to exaggerate the reality and emphasis of the real, that is, corporeal presence, and not to explain it away as the African bishop virtually does.

Euphraimius, bishop of Antioch, speaks exactly as a modern Protestant. He remarks, "The body of Christ, which is received by the faithful, loses nothing of its sensible substance, nor is it separated from the intelligible grace. So baptism, being entirely one in itself, keepeth the property of its sensible substance—that is, water, and loseth not that which it was before."‡ It is certain this is not the doctrine so carefully elaborated at Trent. As has been remarked above, it is no wonder that the Fathers should call the sacred symbols by the names of the things which they represent, and which, in virtue and effect, they become to the worthy recipient; but it would be a strange thing indeed, if, believing

* Sacrificium panis et vini Ecclesia Catholica per universum orbem terræ offerre non cessat. Augustin. de fide ad Petr. Diacon. cap. 19.

† Facund. l., 9. Defens. Trin cap. 5.

‡ Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται, καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαίρετον μένει χάριτος· καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα δὲ πνευμάτικον, ὅλον γενόμενον καὶ ἓν ὑπάρχον, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας τοῦ ὕδατος λέγω, διασώζει, καὶ ὅ γέγονεν οὐκ ἀπώλεσεν. Photius Bibliothec., p. 415. Edit. Augustæ Vindelic. 1601.

that there was nothing in the sacrament but Christ's real body and blood, they should still call it *bread*, *wine*, *figure*, &c. In the seventh century we have Isidore of Seville saying, "Bread, because it strengtheneth the body, is therefore called Christ's body; and wine, because it worketh blood in the flesh, it hath therefore relation to the blood of Christ; but these two being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, are changed into a sacrament of the body and blood of Christ."* And Hesychius: "We eat this food by receiving the memory of His passion: not of His glory, but of His passion."† The same author saith, "Our mystery is both bread and flesh."‡ All of which expressions are verbally and doctrinally antagonistic to the Church of Rome.

In the eighth century we find Bede and Alcuin quoting largely from Jerome and Augustine on the subject which now engages our attention, but in no way do they indicate any tendency to the opinions which we to-day repudiate. The following estimate of their writings, is given in "Soames's Bampton Lectures,"§ where the authorities are also given at large. As I have already given Augustine's commentary on the sixth of John (see Appendix H, p. lxxxiii.), whence these extracts are, for the most part, taken, I shall not repeat them here. Soames writes as follows:

"In commenting upon the Psalms, Bede affirms, that Jesus gave to His disciples, at the last Supper, 'the *figure* of His holy body and blood.' This passage is obviously decisive. It hence appears abundantly, that from the great spiritual guide of our distant ancestors they could never have imbibed the Romish Eucharistic doctrines. Nor, in reality, is this fact proved less effectually from Bede's parallel between the Lord's Supper and the

* Sed panis quià confirmat corpus, ideo corpus Christi nuncupatur; vinum autem quià sanguinem operatur in carne, ideò ad sanguinem Christi refertur,—hæc autem duo sunt visibilia sanctificata tamen per SS. in Sacramentum divini corporis transeunt. Isidor. de Offic. Ecclesiast. lib. i., cap. 18.

† Comedimus autem nunc cibum, sumentes ejus memoriam passionis.—Hesych. in Levit., lib. i., c. 2.

‡ Mysterium dicitur, quod simul panis et caro est.—Id. ibid., lib. ii., c. 8.

§ See Lecture vii., with proofs and illustrations.

passover. In the former celebration, we are told, Jesus 'substituted, for the flesh and blood of a lamb, the sacrament of His own body and blood.' In the days of our venerable countryman, we are assured, expressly, the term *sacrament* meant a *sacred sign*. The Son of man, then, in instituting the Holy Supper, did not remove a shadow to make way for a substance. He merely substituted one sacred sign for another.

"In the same spirit of interpretation Alcuin speaks of our Lord's presence in the world. After His ascension, Jesus, we are told, became absent carnally from this lower scene. In His divinity He will be present with His faithful people to the end of time. And could such language be deliberately used by a scholarly believer in transubstantiation? Do not those who hold that doctrine consider the very flesh of their blessed Master to be daily presented, under a veil, indeed, but palpably, notwithstanding, to the senses of all who frequent the Eucharistic sacrifice? It is also worthy of remark, that Alcuin represents the act of our adorable Saviour, at the last Supper, as a consecration merely, the offering being that of Himself. Thus, our illustrious countryman, far from affording such favourable inferential evidence as, at least, a belief in transubstantiation indispensably requires, even adds to the weight of direct testimony against that doctrine.

"Alcuin's imperial friend and pupil in theology, allows not, however, any doubt as to that celebrated scholar's rejection of the corporal presence. Charlemain plainly designates, in a letter to him, the bread and wine given by Jesus to His disciples, at His parting paschal meal, as 'a *figure* of His body and blood, and as the exhibition of a mighty sacrament, highly beneficial to mankind.' Nor in those books against the worship of images, for which the world is, probably, largely indebted to Alcuin's pen, does the emperor fail of asserting, in repeated instances, the mystical and sacramental, that is, figurative character of the Holy Supper."

But the following century did not lack persons of like minds to

think, and of like ability and courage to express their thoughts on the subject of the then growing heresy of a corporeal presence. Rabanus Maurus, abbot of Fulden, Haymo, bishop of Halberstal, Johannes Scotus Erigena, Christianus Druthmarus, and Bertram, monks, the latter of the abbey of Corbey, where Paschasius himself was abbot, have, each and all, left their clear testimony against the idea of any corporeal and substantial change in their day. Hear the foregoing authority with reference to these:

"But the most famous of those whom Alcuin formed to intellectual eminence was Raban Maur. This illustrious metropolitan is commemorated by Baronius, Bellarmine, and Sixtus of Sienna, as profoundly learned, the brilliant star of Germany, the prince of contemporary divines, equally an example of piety and erudition, a perfect master of rhetoric, poetry, philosophy, theology. Our national school might well be proud of producing such a pupil; and its Eucharistic doctrines are not likely to be learnt from any abler, safer, more honoured pen. How, then, does Raban's testimony affect the most prominent, the 'great, burning article of the Romish creed,' as Archbishop Tillotson has strongly but aptly, and not unfairly, called it? The Moguntine metropolitan plainly pronounces the consecrated elements liable to all the accidents of ordinary food; a position utterly irreconcileable with a belief in transubstantiation; a position which, indeed, those who hold that doctrine *must* and *do* consider disgusting, intolerable, and even blasphemous.* He restricts the eating of Christ's body to the faithful; those, namely, who, living in obedience and piety, are careful to comport themselves as members of the Saviour. He pronounces, that the consecrated elements pass, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, into a sacrament, that is, a sacred sign, of our Lord's body. He draws a parallel between the act of Moses, in establishing God's covenant with His ancient people, and the act of Jesus, in His last paschal supper. Hence he describes the Eucharistic cup as mystical and typical. Thus

* That all are not staggered by this *disgusting, intolerable*, and *blasphemous position*, see above, page 72.

this *brilliant star*, this *perfect master* of *theology*, this *eminently pious* prelate, whom Romish authors, in their eager appropriation of every celebrated ancient name, are so anxious to claim as their own, and who certainly sheds no common lustre upon our Anglo-Saxon school, is convicted of an utter disbelief in the principal distinctive doctrine of the modern papal Church.* Raban's testimonies against this doctrine are indeed so repeated, plain, and utterly unmanageable, that a mark of obloquy was early placed against his name. William of Malmesbury, accordingly, admonishes his readers to beware of this famous prelate, as being tainted with a most offensive unsoundness of opinion respecting the blessed sacrament; and he stigmatizes him besides as a mere plagiary, whose writings are worthy only of oblivion.

"This alleged unsoundness, however, evidently flowed from no headiness, no love of singularity and novelty, on Raban's part. It was plainly acquired under Alcuin's tuition. Haymo of Halberstadt, accordingly, an Englishman by birth, it is believed, and undoubtedly a fellow-pupil with the celebrated archbishop of Mentz, falls but little short of him in evincing that the Eucharistic traditions taught in our ancient Church were widely different from those of modern Rome. Haymo explains our blessed Lord's language, as to the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood, by the union subsisting between Him and His faithful

* Rabanus saith, "Bread, because it strengtheneth the body, is therefore called the body; and wine, because it maketh blood, is therefore referred to Christ's blood." Quia panis corporis cor confirmat, ideo ille congruenter corpus Christi nuncupatur; et quia vinum sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo refertur ad sanguinem. Again he goes on to say, "That the sacrament is one thing and the power thereof another; the sacrament is turned into the nourishment of the body; by the virtue of the sacrament we attain eternal life." Aliud est sacramentum, aliud vis sacramenti; sacramentum in alimentum corporis redigitur, virtute sacramenti æternæ vitæ dignitas adipiscitur. Raban. de Instit. Cleric. l. i., cap. 31. It is easy to see here how nearly this is a transcript from Augustine's commentary, as was before intimated in the case of Bede and Alcuin. And in another place he saith, "That Christ at first instituted the sacrament of His body and blood with blessing and thanksgiving, and delivered it to His apostles and they to their successors, to do accordingly; and that now the whole Church throughout the world observes this manner." Quod exinde apostoli imitati fecere, et successores suos facere docuerunt; quod et nunc per totum terrarum orbem generaliter tota custodit ecclesia. Ibid. cap. 32.

people. Like Raban, he copies Bede, in drawing an analogy between the passover and the last supper. He describes the consecrated bread as the true body of Christ to those who are predestined to eternal life. It is not, then, the true body of Christ to reprobates. Again: he says expressly that our Lord's 'body and blood are called a sacrament, that is, a sacred sign.' This passage is conclusive. We have here another divine of the English school, who not only withholds that inferential evidence in favour of transubstantiation, which, at least, the doctrine requires, but who plainly ascribes a figurative character to the Eucharistic elements.*

"Druthmar of Corbey, also, said to have been a disciple of Bede, designates the Eucharist as the *sacrament* of Christ's body and blood; and speaks of it unequivocally, as figurative in its nature. He likewise adopts a beautiful comparison from Sedulius, a native of these islands, and probably contemporary with him, which a believer in the corporal presence would be very little likely to approve. Sedulius happily describes the last supper as a meal taken, amidst a company of loved associates, by one about to leave them for a distant journey, and desirous of prescribing to them some significant ceremony, of which their affection for him should ensure the constant repetition, and which

* Haymo saith the same with Rabanus [Haimo in pass. secund. Marc. Fer. 3 palm.]: he also calls the Eucharist "a memorial, that gift or legacy, which Christ dimissed unto us at His death." Sacramentum muneris æterni quod nobis Dominus passurus in memoriam sui dimisit tenendum Haimo in 1 Cor. cap. 11. And again, "Corpus ergo Christi et sanguis, sacramentum dicuntur, id est, sacrum signum, non sui ipsius, ut præmissum est et probatum, sed ad similitudinem sumentium revera signa dicuntur? sicut enim panis, qui sacratus fit corpus Christi, ex multis granis fit unus panis, et potus ille qui sanctificatus efficitur sanguis Christi, ex multis acinis fit unus potus; sic omnes digne sumentes hoc sacramentum, ex multis, unum in Christo efficiuntur. Possunt et aliter corpus Christi et sanguis signa nominari, quod manducamus et in corpus Christi nostrum trajicimus, quodam modo nobis incorporari videtur et uniri. Significat ergo hoc corporalis et temporalis carnis Christi et sanguinis comestio et incorporatio illam æternæ societatis et refectionis visionem spiritalem et sempiternam, qua ei incorporabimur et uniemur in futuro, sic sine fine cum eo permansuri, ad quod nos perduci posse integra fide, alacri spe, flagranti caritate præsumendum est."—Tractatus Aimonis, al. Haimonis, de Cor. et Sang. Dom. in Spicilegio Domini Lucæ Acherii. Paris. 1675. tom. xii. p. 29.

should thus incessantly recall his claims to their kind and grateful recollection.*

"While our national school of theology was thus adorned by the mightiest names of their age, and was bearing such decided testimony against a belief in transubstantiation, Paschasius Radbert offered to the world his famous assertion of the corporal presence. This doctrine was thus reduced to that tangible form which calls for a distinct approbation or denial. What, then, was now the conduct of those luminaries who had been trained, under English instruction, to direct public opinion? Did they look unconcernedly upon the controversy, thus shewing themselves convinced by the reasonings of Radbert, or indifferent to their progress? Or did his doctrines win their expressed approbation? or, on the other hand, excite their opposition? By Raban Maur this last course was adopted with vigour and decision. He speaks of those, accordingly, who taught the corporal presence, as persons holding an erroneous opinion, an opinion, too (and this is a most important assertion), of recent origin. He says, likewise, that he had exerted himself, in a particular piece, to stay the progress of this erroneous novelty. The piece to which the archbishop refers has never been brought to light. It has, therefore, probably perished, either from the corrosive hand of time, or from the disingenuous policy of some believer in transubstantiation. Perhaps, however, as we know the work to have been written, its loss is of no great importance. We may well rest satisfied with the notorious and indisputable facts, that *the bright star of Germany, the pious* Raban, *the prince of contemporary philosophers and divines*, took up the pen of controversy to convict of error a belief in the corporal presence, and to brand it as a

* Christianus Druthmarus, reporting our Saviour's act at His last supper, saith, "Christ changed the bread into His body and the wine into His blood spiritually;" he speaks not of any change of substances. Transferens spiritualiter panem in corpus suum, et vinem et sanguinem. Chr. Druthmar. in cap. xxvi. Matt. tom. 9, in Biblioth. vet. Pat. Colon. 1618. Walafridus Strabo saith, "That Christ delivered to His disciples the sacrament of His body and blood, *in panis et vini substantia*, in the substance of bread and wine." Dominus corporis et sanguinis sui sacramenta in panis et vini substantia discipulis tradidit. Wal. Strabo de reb. Eccles. c. 16.

novelty. This latter position, at least, Raban *must* have been able to establish. What, then, becomes of those assurances, which have left so many blood-stained pages upon the annals of western Europe, that a belief in the corporal presence is a divine and apostolical tradition? Here is an individual, extolled by the most eminent asserters of that alleged tradition, in terms even approaching extravagance and hyperbole, who testifies expressly that it was a novelty so lately as the ninth century.

"Nor was the honour of arresting the progress of this portentous novelty confined to a foreign disciple of our national school. Erigena, pre-eminent among European scholars, in the generation immediately succeeding that of Raban, became a professed and zealous opponent of a belief in the corporal presence. His attack, indeed, upon the hypothesis of Radbert was so direct and elaborate, that it was formally condemned, after the lapse of two centuries, by an Italian council; transubstantiation having gained, in the mean time, a secure establishment within the Roman Church. Hence, probably, has arisen the complete disappearance of Erigena's controversial piece from repositories of literary treasures. How could those, indeed, who recommended the doctrine of transubstantiation as a divine and apostolical tradition, endure such an exposure of its novelty and unsoundness?"

But if the treatise of Scotus is lost, that of Bertram, or Ratram, written at the same time, and under the same circumstances, yet survives. These two illustrious men were commanded by the Emperor Charles the Bold, to write their opinions upon the then new tenet of Paschasius, which was at the time much controverted. The work of Bertram yet exists, and is as satisfactory a proof of the non-Popish doctrine of the Church, at the time of its production, as we could desire. In this place I shall give but an extract or two, though, as its importance is so manifestly great, I have given the tract entire in the Appendix (page i.) It is really astonishing that, with such irresistible evidences of the belief of the mediæval Church, any one should have the audacity to assert that transubstantiation was one of its doctrines. That "the

faithful" should have endeavoured to put it out of the way, as well as its sister treatise of Erigena, is not much to be wondered at, considering what we know of the recognition of "pious frauds;" but it is, perhaps, a matter of surprise that we should at this day possess it.* Interpolation, excision, forgery, repudiation, corruption of all sorts, have been tried upon almost every ancient and mediæval author. If we could entirely recover the veritable

* The struggle which this treatise of Bertram has had for its life, will be seen by the short notice prefixed to it in the Appendix. Not very different was the fate of Ælfric's homily, which has been interpolated and expurgated, in delivery and in manuscript, as will be seen by the following notice from Soames's lectures, above quoted: "As the years rolled on, this doctrine became highly distasteful to the ruling ecclesiastics. Lanfranc, who, first under Norman domination, filled the see of Canterbury, had earned notoriety by controverting Berenger's opposition to the corporal presence. His influence was, therefore, naturally exerted to establish in England those principles for which he had laboured so strenuously upon the continent. Among the fruits of this change in the national religion, was one of those disingenuous expedients which imprint a character of unsoundness upon any cause. Those who desired to undermine Ælfric's opinions, yet found themselves unable to overthrow his popularity. They ventured not, accordingly, to banish his instructions from the pulpit. On Easter-day the people were still allowed to hear that well-known paschal homily which had taught their fathers to view the holy supper as a figurative repast upon the Saviour. But its proportions were grievously curtailed. Wherever Ælfric, in admitting fabulous narrations, had shewn himself ensnared by that credulity which necessarily clings to an age like his, the seeming repeater of his discourse failed not of exact fidelity. Nor was this individual's accuracy less when the original made use of language in any manner favourable to the corporal presence. Passages, however, of an opposite tendency, were unsparingly retrenched, and the whole homily was thus imposed upon the people in such a guise as made it utter doctrine widely different from that which its admirable author had inculcated. In such discreditable devices, who does not detect a consciousness of weakness? who does not hear a tacit admission, that 'from the beginning it was not so?' Had not, indeed, Ælfric's mutilators been afraid of confronting fairly his opinions with their own, would they not have adopted a very different course? Would they not have boldly branded his belief with heresy and novelty? Would they not have openly and ignominiously rejected his discourses from the house of God, as unworthy of resounding within its consecrated portals, as a disgrace to the Christian preacher's lips, a snare and a defilement to the ears of a faithful congregation? Who will not infer, from the surreptitious manner in which our fathers were weaned from Ælfric's opinions, that an attack upon his character, until he was wholly forgotten, would have excited their indignation, a charge of novelty levelled against his doctrine, their contemptuous derision? This artful dealing with his famous paschal homily furnishes, therefore, another argument against those who would number transubstantiation among traditions taught by the Anglo-Saxon Church. It is an additional link in that adamantine chain of testimonies, extending unbrokenly from Bede to the Norman Conquest, which proves, even to demonstration, that ancient England was taught expressly to deny the leading distinctive doctrine of modern Rome."

writings of those whose names are held in honour by the Church, undoubtedly we should have as strong testimony against the peculiar doctrines of Rome, and *this* of our enquiry especially, as could be penned now by Protestant writers. When error became dominant, every trace of the opposing truth was erased, every evidence removed from observation, and put beyond recovery, by every nefarious means which the unscrupulous could discover. These succeeded in their unholy crusade against men and books, to such an extent that the Church is irreparably injured; they could not succeed to the fullest extent, and so, thanks to a superintending Providence, the Church is not ruined. Such testimonies as the following must ever prove a heavy condemnation to all who hold the errors which they overthrow.

In the tenth century the evidence is sparing. If, however, it be scanty, it is yet most undoubted. The chief is that derived from an authority in the early English Church, which puts it beyond all doubt as to what doctrine was taught here by our Saxon forefathers. Ælfric, whose history is somewhat confused, probably from there having been more of the name, and the records being few, has left us a homily, still extant in the original Saxon, as well as several other products of his pen, as letters, sermons, &c., in which the belief of the English Church on the Eucharist, in the tenth century, is distinctly and fully set forth. The homily was one which was read on Easter Sunday, generally, throughout the country; and, therefore, must be looked upon as of equal authority in every part of the Church. Having given it entire in the Appendix (page xxxix.), I will here give but a single quotation from it; merely observing, that Johnson, in the preface to his "Collection of Ecclesiastical Laws," says, "I am fully persuaded that the homilies of Ælfric are more positive against the doctrine of transubstantiation than the homilies of the Church of England, compiled in the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth."

"Much is betwixt the invisible might of the holy housel, and the visible shape of His proper nature. It is naturally corruptible

bread, and corruptible wine; and is, by might of God's word, truly Christ's body and His blood; not so, notwithstanding, bodily, but ghostly. Much is betwixt the body Christ suffered in, and the body that is hallowed to housel. The body, truly, that Christ suffered in was born of the flesh of Mary, with blood and with bone, with skin and with sinews, in human limbs, with a reasonable soul living; and His ghostly body, which we call the housel, is gathered of many corns, without blood and bone, without limb, without soul; and therefore nothing is to be understood therein bodily, but all is ghostly to be understood."*

And it will be seen that the following extracts from two of Ælfric's letters are not a whit less distinct or decided in the great matter which engages our attention. It is manifest that in endeavouring to carry us back to transubstantiation, those who make the attempt are not seeking to restore us to the old doctrine of the English Church, but to a modern one, which overlayed or superseded the ancient faith of the Church. These extracts are from L'Isle's translation, "printed by John Haviland, and are to be sold by H. Seile: 1623," and follow immediately after the "Paschal Homily."

"Here followeth the words of Elfrike, abbot of S. Albons, and also of Malmesbury, taken out of his epistle written to Wylfine, bishop of Scyrburne. It is found in a booke of the old Saxon tongue, wherein be xliij. chapters of canons and ecclesiasticall constitutions, and also *Liber Pœnitentialis*, that is, a penitentiall booke, or shrift booke, diuided into foure other bookes; the epistle is set for the 30. chapter of the fourth booke, intituled "Priests-Synode:" and this epistle is also in a canon booke of the Church of Exeter.

Heere thou seest (good reader) how Elfrike, vpon finding fault with an abuse of his time, which was, that priests on Easter day filled their housell boxe, and so kept

"Some priests keepe the housell that is consecrate on Easter day all the yeare for sicke men. But they doe greatly amisse, because it waxeth hoary. And these will not vnderstand how grieuous penance the pœnitentiall booke teacheth by this, if the housell become hoary or rotten, or if it bee lost, or bee eaten of mouse or beast by negligence. Men shall reserue more

* L'Isle's Trans.

the bread a whole yeare for sicke men, tooke an occasion to speake against the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament. So also in another Epistle sent to Wulfstane, archbishop of Yorke, hee reprehending again this ouerlong reseruing of the housell, addeth also words more at large against the same bodily presence. His words be these:

carefully that holy housell, and not reserue it too long, but consecrate other of new for sicke men alwayes within a weeke or a fortnight, that it be not so much as hoary. For so holy is the housell which to-day is hallowed, as that which on Easter day was hallowed. That housell is Christ's body, not bodily, but ghostly. Not the body which He suffered in, but the body of which Hee spake, when Hee blessed bread and wine to housell a night before His suffering, and said by the blessed bread, this is my body: and againe by the holy wine, this is my bloud, which is shed for many in forgiuenesse of sinnes. Vnderstand now that the Lord, who could turne that bread before His suffering to His body, and that wine to his bloud ghostly; that the selfe same Lord blesseth daily through the priest's hands bread and wine to His ghostly body, and to His ghostly bloud.

"Some priests fill their boxe for housell on Easter day, and so reserue it a whole yeare for sicke men, as though that housell were more holy than any other. But they doe vnaduisedly, because it waxeth hoary, or altogether rotten by keeping it so long space. And thus is hee become guilty, as the booke witnesseth to vs. If any doe keepe the housell too long, or lose it, or mice, or other beasts doe eat it, see what the pœnitentiall booke saith by this. So holy is altogether that housell, which is hallowed to-day, as that which is hallowed on Easter day. Wherefore I beseech you to keepe that holy body of Christ with more aduisement for sicke men, from Sunday to Sunday, in a very cleane boxe: or, at the most, not to keepe it aboue a fortnight, and then eat it, laying other in the place. Wee haue an example hereof in Moyses bookes, as God Himselfe hath commanded in Moyses law: how the priests should set on euery Saturday twelve loaues, all new baked, vpon the tabernacle, the which were called *panes propositionis;* and those should stand there on God's tabernacle, till the next Saturday, and then did the priests themselues eat them, and set other in the place. Some priests will not eat the housell which they doe hallow. But wee will now declare vnto you how the booke speaketh by them. *Presbyter missam celebrans, et non audens sumere sacrificium, accusante conscientia sua, anathema est:* The priest that doth say masse, and dare not eat the housell, his conscience accusing him, is accursed. It is lesse danger to receiue the housell, than to hallow it. He that doth twice hallow one host to

housell, is like vnto those heretickes who do christen twice one child. Christ Himselfe blessed housell before His suffering: Hee blessed the bread, and brake, thus speaking to his apostles: 'Eat this bread, it is my body.' And againe He blessed one chalice with wine, and thus also speaketh vnto them: 'Drinke ye all of this, it is mine owne bloud of the New Testament, which is shed for many in forgiuenes of sinnes.' The Lord which hallowed housell before His suffering, and saith, that the bread was His owne body, and that the wine was truly His bloud, He halloweth daily, by the hands of the priest, bread to His body, and wine to His bloud, in ghostly mystery, as wee read in bookes. And yet that liuely bread is not bodily so notwithstanding: not the selfe-same body that Christ suffered in. Nor that holy wine is the Sauiour's bloud, which was shed for vs in bodily thing: but in ghostly understanding. Both bee truly that bread His body, and that wine also His bloud, and was the heauenly bread, which we call manna, that fed forty yeares God's people. And the cleare water which did then run from the stone in the wildernesse, was truly His bloud, as Paul wrote on some of his epistles: *Omnes patres nostri eandem escam spiritualem manducauerunt, et omnes eundem potum spiritualem biberunt*, &c. All our fathers ate in the wildernesse the same ghostly meat, and dranke the same ghostly drinke. They drank of that ghostly stone, and that stone was Christ. The apostle hath said, as you now haue heard, that they all did eat the same ghostly meat, and they all did drinke the same ghostly drinke. And hee saith, not bodily, but ghostly. And Christ was not yet borne, nor His bloud shed, when that the people of Israel ate that meat, and dranke of that stone. And the stone was not bodily Christ, though Hee so said. It was the same mystery in the old law, and they did ghostly signifie that ghostly housell of our Sauiour's body, which wee consecrate now."*

* This epistle to Wulfstane Elfrike, wrote first in the Latine tongue, as in a short Latine epistle set before this, and one other of his Saxon epistles, he confesseth thus: "Ælfricus Abbas Wulfstano venerabili archiepiscopo salutem in Christo. Ecce paruimus vestræ almitatis jussionibus transferentes Anglice duas epistolas quas Latino eloquio descriptas ante annum vobis destinavimus, non tamen semper ordinem sequentes, nec verbum ex verbo; sed sensum ex sensu proferentes." Behold wee haue obeyed the commandement of thy excellencie in translating into English the two epistles which wee sent vnto thee, written in Latine more than a yeere agoe. Howbeit we keepe not heere alwayes the same order, nor yet translate word for word, but sense for sense. Now, because very few there be that doe vnderstand the old English or Saxon (so much is our speech changed from the vse of that time wherein Elfrike liued), and for that also it may be that some will doubt how skilfully and also faithfully these words of Elfrike bee translated from the Saxon tongue; wee haue thought good to set downe heere last of all the very words also of his Latine epistle, which is recorded in bookes

Well might Johnson write as above; for no condemnation of the Popish figment could be more emphatic, consistent, and clear. It appears manifest that these extracts were written at a time when it was necessary to guard against the idea of a corporeal presence, and that these sentiments were those of the bishops to whom the epistles, whence they are taken, were addressed, can hardly be doubted. In whatever estimation Ælfric was held in his own generation, it appears certain that he cannot be confounded with another of the same name who held the see of Canterbury. These letters are, therefore, those of an inferior

faire written of old in the cathedrall churches of Worcester and Excester.—Qvidam vero presbyteri implent alabastrum suum de sacrificio, quod in pasca Domini santificant: et conseruant per totum annum ad infirmos, quasi sanctior sit cæteris sacrificiis. Sed nimium insipienter faciunt. Quia nigrescit, et putrescit tamdiu conseruatum. Et liber pœnitentialis pro tali negligentia pœnitentiam magnam docet: aut si a muribus comestum sit: aut ab auibus raptum. Tam sanctum est sacrificium, quod hodie sanctificatur, quam illud quod in die pascæ consecratum est. Et ideo debetis a dominica in dominicam, aut per duos, vel maxime tres hebdomadas tenere sacrificium in alabastro mundo ad infirmos; ne nigrescat, aut putrescat, si diutius seruetur. Nam in lege Moisi ponebant sacerdotes semper omni sabbato panes propositionis calidos in tabernaculo coram Domino; et in sequenti sabbato sumebant illos soli sacerdotes, et edebant; et alios nouos pro eis ponebant. Facite et vos sacerdotes similiter. Custodite caute sacrificium Christi ad infirmos, et edite illud, ne diutius teneatur, quam oportet. Et reponite aliud nouiter sanctificatum propter necessitatem infirmorum, ne sine viatico exeant de hoc seculo. Christus Iesus in die suæ sanctæ cœnæ accepit panem, benedixit, ac fregit; dedit discipulis suis dicens, accipite, et comedite; hoc est enim corpus meum. Similiter et calicem accipiens gratias egit, et dedit illis dicens: bibite ex hoc omnes. Hic est sanguis meus noui Testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Intelligite modo sacerdotes, quod ille Dominus qui ante passionem suam potuit conuertere illum panem, et illud vinum ad suum corpus et sanguinem; quod ipse quotidie sanctificat per manus sacerdotum suorum panem ad suum corpus spiritualiter; et vinum ad suum sanguinem. (Non sit tamen hoc sacrificium corpus eius in quo passus est pro nobis; neque sanguis eius, quem pro nobis effudit; sed spiritualiter corpus eius efficitur et sanguis; sicut manna quod de cœlo pluit, et aqua quæ de petra fluxit. Sicut Paulus Apostolus ait.) Nolo enim vos ignorare fratres, quoniam patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt; et omnes mare transierunt: et omnes in Moysi baptizati sunt in nube et in mari. Et omnes eandem escam spiritualem manducauerunt; et omnes eundem potum spiritualem biberunt. Bibebant autem de spirituali consequenti eos petra. Patra autem erat Christus. Vnde dicit psalmista, panem cœli dedit eis. Panem angelorum manducauit homo. Nos quoque proculdubio manducamus panem angelorum; et bibimus de illa petra, quæ Christum significabat; quoties fideliter accedimus ad sacrificium corporis et sanguinis Christi."—Test. Antiq. &c.

The words inclosed between the two halfe circles, some had rased out of Worceter booke, but they are restored again out of a booke of Exeter Church.

to superiors in the Church, and cannot be deemed at variance with the sentiments of those to whom they were sent.

Soames well remarks on a similar view of these epistles, "But a circumstance, greatly enhancing the value of these testimonies, has not hitherto received its due share of attention. Both of them occur in addresses of considerable length to the clerical order; addresses which embody the leading points of doctrine and discipline established among our Anglo-Saxon ancestry. They may therefore fairly be considered as pastoral letters; and hence were undoubtedly composed with all that regard to accuracy which public functionaries necessarily use in the preparation of authentic instruments. Who, then, will doubt, that these two epistles and the paschal homily deliver a correct exposition of the doctrine which our national Church professed in Ælfric's day?

In the following century, when the Normans overran the English Church and nation, there can be no doubt but that the foundation of a great change was laid in the faith of the Church on this important article of the Eucharist. Lanfranc, who had distinguished himself in opposition to, and in disputations with, Berengarius, was made Archbishop of Canterbury by the Conqueror, and no doubt, in a great measure, owed his elevation to the part he had taken against the archdeacon. But the testimony of Berengarius himself is very clear in this century, and not only so, but the conduct of his opponents gives the strongest proof that the doctrine which he opposed, as well as ourselves, was not then fixed, for the very words in which he was compelled to make his recantation at first, were afterwards declared as heretical as the doctrine which he abjured. At first Berengarius was summoned to a synod held at Vercelli, in 1050, presided over by Leo IX., whereat the archdeacon did not attend, which, however, did not prevent his condemnation, and the burning of the work of Johannes Scotus, which was said to have led him astray. But this was not the only pope with whom Berengarius had to compete. Victor II., Nicol. II., Gregor. VII.,—all demanded either the abjuration of former abjurations as heretical, or some further one as more

safe and orthodox. The eventful history of the poor archdeacon is thus summed up by one whose volume on the Popish controversy is a valuable handbook on every branch of the subjects in dispute between the churches.* This author remarks :—" Great opposition was given to this doctrine in Germany and France, by Bruno, archbishop of Cologne, and the celebrated Berengarius, of Tours, who, in A.D. 1059, was compelled to recant his opposition, and profess his faith in these words :—' That the bread and wine which are set upon the altar after the consecration, are not only the sacrament, but the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ : and are sensibly, not only in the sacrament, but in truth handled and broken by the hands of the priest, and ground and bruised by the teeth of the faithful.'† But it appears that the pope and council were not sufficiently skilful to express themselves perfectly clear in this matter ; for the gloss upon the canon law says, ' unless we understand these words of Berengarius (viz. the words which the pope and council compelled him to speak) in a sound sense, we shall fall into a greater heresy than that of Berengarius ; for we do not make parts of the body of Christ.' I cannot conceive what can be the meaning of this gloss. ' that the body of Christ, though it be in reality broken, yet it is not broken into *parts*,' but into *wholes*. Now, this breaking of a body, not into parts, but into wholes, which in truth is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, though to persons who believe in transubstantiation, for any thing I know, it may appear sound sense ; yet to persons who cannot believe in this doctrine, it appears to be downright nonsense.‡ Pope Gregory VII., twenty years after, A.D. 1079, becoming sensible of this absurdity, made Berengarius, in another

* "Comparative View of the Anglican and Roman Churches."—Curry, Dublin, 1836.

† Ego Berengarius—profiteor me tenere, panem et vinum quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem, non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum quæ corpus, et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et sensualitèr, non solùm sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri. Gratian. de Consecrat. Dist. 2. cap. Ego Berengar.

‡ That this absurdity is one of the "developments" of the Romish Church, consequent upon, but not contemporary with, the belief of transubstantiation, the following will clearly shew. I have taken it from "Faber's History of the Waldenses and

council assembled at Rome, recant in another form, viz., that 'the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar are substantially changed into the true and proper quickening flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and after consecration are the true body

Albigenses," to which I am indebted for other matter respecting the same interesting peoples. The whole is put with the venerable author's usual force and perspicuity:—"William of Malmsbury, who flourished during the reigns of our three first Norman kings, after censuring the pretended heresy of his contemporary Berenger, professes his own full belief, that, after the ecclesiastical benediction, the elements are the true body and blood of the Saviour; and he says, that he was induced thereto, both by the ancient authority of the Church, and likewise by many newly-displayed miracles. One of these convincing miracles was the following:—'A little Jew boy, entering into a Church with a Christian boy, beheld, upon the altar, a child, torn limb from limb, and thus severally divided to the people. Returning home, he innocently told the story to his parents, who, in a rage, threw him upon a burning pile. Here he lay unhurt for several hours, until at length he was drawn out by the Christians. When asked how he escaped the effects of the fire, he said, "The beautiful woman, whom I beheld sitting on a throne, and whose son was divided to the people, always stood at my right hand in the furnace, turning aside with her robe the volume of fire and smoke."' Nos sane credimus, post benedictionem ecclesiasticam, illa mysteria esse verum corpus et sanguinem Salvatoris; adducti, et veteri ecclesiæ auctoritate, et multis noviter ostensis miraculis. Quale fuit, quod beatus Gregorius exhibuit Romæ. Quale, quod Pascasius narrat contigisse in Alemannia, presbyterum Plegildum visibiliter speciem pueri in altari contrectasse, et, post libata oscula in panis similitudine, conversum ecclesiastico more, sumpsisse; quod, arroganti cavillatione. ferunt Berengarium carpere solitum, et dicere; speciosa certe Pax nebulonis, ut cui oris præbuerat basium, dentium inferrat exigium. Quale, de pusione judaico, qui, in ecclesiam cum æquævo Christiano forte et ludibunde ingressus, vidit puerum in ara membratim discerpi et viritim populo dividi; id cum innocentia puerili parentibus pro vero assereret, in rogum detrusum, ubi occluso ostio æstuabat incendium, multis post horis, sine jactura corporis exuviarum et crinium, a Christianis extractum; interrogatusque, quomodo voraces ignium globos evaserit, respondit: "Illa pulchra fœmina, quam vidi sedere in cathedra, cujus filius populo dividebatur, semper mihi in camino ad dextram astitit, flammeas minas et fumea volumina peplo suo submovens."'—De Gest. Anglor. Continuat. lib. iii., c. 27. Now, it is clear that this figment, detailed by William with implicit credulity and evidently with full approbation, could never have been constructed save on the basis of the recognised orthodox theology of the eleventh century. Therefore, the orthodox theology of the eleventh century must have been, that, in each celebration of the Eucharist, the entire coherent mass of bread was changed into the *undivided* body of *one* Christ; and that such body, when distributed to the communicants, was afterwards *divided* into numerous portions or fragments, so that each communicant received, not the *whole* Christ, but a *part* only of a leg or an arm, or any other member, according as it might happen. Yet, strange to say, what in the eleventh century was so pre-eminently orthodox as to be confirmed by the testimony of a miracle, had become, in the sixteenth century, such a dam-

of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and which, being offered for the salvation of the world, did hang upon the cross, and sits at the right hand of the Father.' "

nable heresy, that the infallible Fathers of the Tridentine Council actually subjected the unlucky holder of it to all the pains and penalties of a formal anathema. 'If any one,' say these unerring settlers of the faith, 'shall deny that, in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, the *whole* Christ is contained under each species, and, when a *separation* is made, under *every part* of each species, let him be anathema.' 'Si quis negaverit, in venerabili sacramento Eucharistiæ, sub unaquaque specie, et sub singulis cujusque speciei partibus, separatione facta, totum Christum contineri, anathema sit.'—Concil. Trident. sess. xiii. c. 8, can. iii. Here I submit, that the decision of the Tridentine Fathers is altogether irreconcileable with the necessary purport of the miracle attested by the little Jew boy.

"The decision of the Tridentine Fathers asserts, that the whole Christ is substantially contained, when a separation is made, under every particle of each species; so that every communicant receives the whole Christ full and complete in all his members. Whereas the purport of the miracle, attested by the little Jew boy, was, that the whole Christ is *not* contained under every particle of each species when a separation is made; for the boy beheld the child Christ on the altar, under the hands of the priest, torn limb from limb, and distributed in this divided state, man by man, to the people. But, in the eleventh century, the miracle, as we learn from William of Malmsbury, was held to be good and sufficient evidence of the soundness of the doctrine then inculcated respecting the practical results of what was afterwards styled *Transubstantiation*; and, in the sixteenth century, the decision of the Tridentine Fathers was held to be a good and sufficient establishment of the entire doctrine of transubstantiation under all its various aspects, which has ever since been devoutly held by each true son of the Roman Church. Hence the orthodoxy of the eleventh century, which denies that the whole Christ is substantially received by every communicant—and the orthodoxy of the sixteenth century, which maintains that the whole Christ is substantially received by every communicant—are two entirely different systems; and hence the miracle which establishes the former, and the decision which establishes the latter, stand so directly opposed to each other, that the decision even pronounces all those to be accursed who adopt the system established by the miracle.

"We have here, I take it, a very ugly business; for the matter finally resolves itself into the following awkward dilemma:—Is the well-meaning Romanist to believe, with his Church in the eleventh century, that in the administration of the Eucharist, Christ's substantial body is divided into as many parts as there are communicants? Or is he to believe with his Church in the sixteenth century, that Christ's substantial body, in the administration of the Eucharist, is *not* divided, but that that every communicant receives substantially the whole Christ, complete in all his members? If the former, then the Fathers of the Tridentine Council, so far from being infallible, must have grievously and presumptuously erred, when they anathematised all those who denied that the *whole* Christ is contained under *every part* of each species. If the latter, then the Church of the eleventh century, so far from being infallible, taught a grossly-erroneous doctrine; and the miracle, which had such a convincing effect upon the mind of William of Malmsbury and

It is not possible to conceive that Berengarius, when he thus combated the growing heresy of the Eucharist, either stood alone, or controverted a long-established doctrine. There is positive evidence that he did not stand alone,* though it has been attempted, as usual, dishonestly to conceal it; and the fact above alluded to, that varied forms of recantation were again and again demanded of him, shews that no settled form of words had as yet been generally adopted to express the mode of presence. And we shall find the same truth manifesting itself very frequently in the following ages.

In the twelfth century the schoolmen began to flourish, and it has been already shewn, by extracts from Peter Lombard, and even Thomas Aquinas, how differently these men spoke from what the advocates of the doctrine of Trent do now. There are many testimonies extant of this age, proving that *all* did not believe in transubstantiation, if some did, as the following, from Birkbeck's "Protestant Evidence," will sufficiently prove:

"1. In this age Gratian, the monk, affordeth us a notable testimony against transubstantiation. His comparison is thus drawn: 'This holy bread is, after its manner, called the body of Christ, as the offering thereof by the hands of the priest is called Christ's passion;' now the priest's oblation is not properly and literally, in strict terms and sense, the passion of Christ; but, as the Gloss hath it, 'the sacrament representing the body of Christ is therefore Christ's flesh, not in verity of the thing, but in a mystery' (namely), as the representation of Christ therein is called His passion.

"Gratian's word's are these: 'As the heavenly bread, which is Christ's flesh, after a sort, is called Christ's body, whereas, indeed, it is the sacrament of His body; and the sacrificing of the flesh of Christ,

his contemporaries, could only have been a disgraceful figment, got up for the establishment of what the Council of Trent, in its infallible wisdom, has since pronounced to be an accursed heresy. At all events, the doctrine of the eleventh century is palpably irreconcileable with the doctrine of the sixteenth century."

* Sigebert's Chronicle, speaking of Berenger's tone, saith, that there was much disputation, and by many, both by word and writing, against him and for him. Where the learned Bishop Usher observes, that the words *et pro eo*, and for him, specially favouring Berenger's cause, are left out in some editions; but they are to be found in other authentic copies.

which is done by the priest's hands, is said to be his passion, not in the truth of the thing, but in a signifying mystery."*

"Johannes Semeca, who was the first that glossed upon Gratian's decrees, telleth us how this comparison is to be meant. 'The sacrament (saith the Gloss), because it doth represent the flesh of Christ, is called the body of Christ, but improperly; not in the truth of the thing, but in the mystical sense—to wit, it is called the body of Christ; that is, it signifieth His body.'†

"From these premises we infer, that, after consecration, the sacrament is not in truth Christ's body, but only in a signifying mystery; *rei veritas*, the truth of the thing, as it is opposed to *significans mysterium*, a signifying mystery, simply excludes the reality of the thing; for it is all one as if he had said, that it is there only in a signifying mystery; as also in saying it is there *suo modo*, after a sort only, he implieth, that it is not there truly, or in the truth of the thing, visibly or invisibly. So that these words of Gratian, drawn from St. Augustine and Prosper, seconded by the Gloss, and inserted into the body of the canon law, confirmed by Pope Gregory XIII., make strongly against the real presence of Christ's body, under the accidents of bread and wine, as my learned friend, Master Doctor Featley, made it appear in his first day's conference with Master Musket, touching transubstantiation.‡

"Besides, there were divers in this age, who employed both their tongues and their pens in defence of this truth.

"2. Zacharius Chrysopolitanus saith, that there were some, perhaps many, but hardly to be discerned and noted, that thought still, as Berengarius did, whom they then condemned, scorning not a little the folly of them that say, the appearing accidents of bread and wine after the conversion, do hang in the air, or that the senses are deceived.§

"3. Rupertus saith, it is not to be concealed, that there are divers, though hardly to be discerned and noted, which are of opinion, and

* Sicut ergo cœlestis panis, qui Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum revera sit Sacramentum corporis Christi—vocaturque immolatio carnis quæ sacerdotis manibus sit, Christi passio—non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio. Decret. part. 3. De Consecrat. Dist. 2.

† Cœleste Sacramentum, quod verè repræsentat Christi carnem, dicitur corpus Christi, sed impropriè, unde dicitur suo modo, sed non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio: ut sit sensus, vocatur corpus Christi, id est, significatur. Gloss, Decret. de Consecrat. Dist. 2. verbo, Cœlestis.

‡ Dr. Featley's Conference with Mr. Musket, April 21, 1621.

§ Sunt nonnulli, imò forsan multi, sed vix notari possunt qui cum damnato Berengario idem sentiunt, et tamen eundem cum Ecclesia damnant. Zachar. Episc. Chrysop. Comment. in Evangel. Montessar. lib. iv., c. 156.

defend the same both by word and writing: that the Fathers under the law did eat and drink the very bread and wine which we receive in the sacrament of the altar. And he said they grounded their opinion upon that of the apostle, 1 Cor. x., 3, 4, 'They did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink of the same spiritual drink (for they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ).'* And the same Rupertus addeth, that 'the Church tolerated this diversity of opinion touching the sacrament of the Eucharist;' for so he saith in his seventh book; whence we may observe, that for so much as the Fathers, under the law, did eat of the same Christ in manna that we do in the sacrament of the Supper, and yet did not, and could not eat Him carnally, who was not then born, nor had flesh: we also in our sacrament can have no such fleshly communication with Christ as some imagine.

"And whereas Bellarmine replies, 'that the Fathers received the same among themselves, but not the same with us Christians;'† he is controlled by St. Augustine, who saith, it was 'the same which we eat; the corporal food indeed was diverse, but the spiritual meat was the same; they eat of the same spiritual meat.' "‡

But it was not alone within the Church that this growing error was withstood. That much-maligned people, the Waldenses and Albigenses, who, perhaps with some unsound peculiarities, opposed the doctrinal errors, and vicious lives of the Romish clergy, are acknowledged by their adversaries not to have believed in transubstantiation. It is true, a very different cause is given for this from what we know to be the true one; for to allege the reason given in the extract in the note, is to repeat what the persons concerned always steadily repudiated, and of the existence of which belief among them, there is no trace whatever. We must put down, therefore, to the account of slander, the *reason* alleged:

* Hoc loco silendum non est, malè quosdam ignotos, sed absconditi nominis homines opinari, suis quoque defendere dictis et scriptis, panem verum et potum, quem in sancto Altari sumimus, nihilominùs Patres illos manducasse tunc temporis et bibisse —huic errori pro maximo argumento adhibent authoritatem apostoli, 1 Cor. x., 3, 4.— Igitur eadem quæ hactenus in Ecclesia toleratur discordantium et contradicentium permixtio. Rupert. lib. vi., in commentar. in Johan. cap. vi.—et in lib. vii.

† At eandem inter se, non nobiscum eandem. Bellar. lib. i. 1. de Euchar. c. 14. Sect. Quia.

‡ Spiritalem utique eandem, nam corporalem alteram; quia illa manna, nos aliud —idem significavit virtute spirituali. Aug. Tract 26. in Joan.

the *fact* is most indubitable.* It will be seen, at a subsequent date, how emphatically these early Protestant tenants of the Valleys repudiated the decrees of Trent, which would stamp with the sanction of Gospel truth the wild fancies of Radbert Paschasius.

Now, in a work of this interesting people, entitled a "Treatise on Antichrist," proved, I think satisfactorily, by Mr. Faber, to belong to the twelfth century, we find the most unequivocal condemnation of the Popish doctrine which we are investigating. In this work, no hesitation is manifested in appropriating to the Church of Rome the title of Antichrist; and the doctrines of that Church are alleged, *seriatim*, as the works of Antichrist; *the falsehood of eternal damnation, covered with the appearance of the truth and righteousness of Christ and His Spouse.* The paragraphs in this treatise, appertaining to our present enquiry, are the following: "His (Antichrist's) first work is, that the service of Latria, properly due to God alone, he perverts unto Antichrist himself, and to his doings; to the poor creature, rational or irrational, sensible or insensible; to man, for instance, male or female saints departed this life; and to their images, or carcases, or relics. His doings are the sacraments, especially that of the Eucharist, which he worships equally with God and Christ, prohibiting the adoration of God alone." And again: "His fourth work is, that he rests the whole religion of the people upon his mass: for, leading them to hear it, he deprives them of spiritual and sacramental manducation."

Here, then, is most satisfactory evidence, not only that long before the days of Luther and the Reformation, the same views on the Eucharist were held as we hold to-day, but also that they were held in *protestation* against the same errors of Rome, as we now protest against. Nothing could more strongly identify

* Est autem opinio eorum detestanda: dicunt enim, quod panis non transubstantiatur in corpus Christi, nec vinum in sanguinem ipsius. Cujus opinionis causa prima est; quia istum materialem panem et vinum mala esse dicunt, asserunt enim quidam eorum a Diabolo creata esse. Alii vero, facta esse a terra, unde hujusmodi cibaria oriuntur. Monet. adv. Cathar. et Valdens. lib. iv., c. 3., s. I., p. 295.

the Waldenses of the twelfth century with the reformers of the sixteenth, than this coincidence, both in profession and protest.

In another ancient document, derived from the same source, called "The Noble Lesson," and which carries its own date, 1100, on its front, we find, amid much very interesting and important matter, the following on the sacrifice of the mass, shewing under what circumstances it was at that time celebrated, and the opinion held by the Waldenses of its validity with regard to the proposed end. Speaking of an unscrupulous sinner, who, on his dying bed, sends for the priest to quiet his soul, "The Noble Lesson" goes on to say: "The priest tells him, that he cannot be forgiven, if he does not restore all that he has taken from another, and well examine his sins. When he hears this, he has great trouble; and he thinks within himself, if he shall restore it entirely, what will remain to his children, and what will the world say? Then he commands his children to examine their faults, and gives money to the priest, that he himself may receive absolution. Though he has extorted from another a hundred pounds, or perhaps two, yet the priest will pardon him for a hundred pence, and sometimes for less, when he can get no more. And he tells him a long story, and promises him pardon; for he will say mass both for him and for his forefathers. Thus grants he pardon to them, whether they be just or felonious, and he puts his hand upon their heads. But, when he leaves them, he occasions a grand festival; for he makes them to understand, that they have been very well absolved. Yet ill are they confessed, who are thus faulty; and they will certainly be deceived by such an absolution; and he that makes them believe it, sins mortally. For I dare to say, and it will be found very true, that all the popes, from Sylvester down to the present one, and all the cardinals, and all the bishops, and all the abbots, even all such put together, have no power to absolve or to pardon a single creature in regard to a single mortal sin; inasmuch as God alone pardons, and no other can do it."

It is here sufficiently manifest, that whatever identity the Romanist may claim for the Church of the twelfth and that of the sixteenth century (I have shown above that there was *not* identity), there is the same evidence to prove the identity of the creed of protesting Christians.

Let it not be wondered at by any, that the evidence of this and the following century is not more abundant. When not only the *works* of authors, which did not suit the taste, and coincide with the opinions of those in power, were burnt, but the unfortunate authors themselves were subjected to the same ordeal, it would have required a strong conviction of duty ere a man would put his pen to paper, when it was to seal his own condemnation; and fortunate, indeed, would have been the production, if it could have escaped the destruction which awaited all such. The wonder, therefore, is rather, not that we have so little, but that we have any. If persecution cannot convince, it can silence; and the history of the devoted Albigenses and Waldenses is proof, sad and sufficient, of the means adopted, and the lengths ventured upon, to quiet the tongues of such stubborn gainsayers. When we look onward into the thirteenth century, we find the few traces of doctrine which manifest themselves amongst these primitive people still in the same direction. But it is well worthy of remark, that almost every notice which exists in this century of opposition to the doctrines of Rome, is to be found in the writings of her own supporters. The faith of the Waldenses and Albigenses is, accordingly, presented to us by Popish writers. Thus, in the "Index of Valdensic Errors," in Gretzer's supplement to Pilichdorf's work against these simple people, he says, "that all the words of the mass, and all the preparations appertaining to the mass, beyond the simple words of consecration, are of error."*

So, also, Conrad of Magdenberg, when speaking of the Bighards, Pighards, or Picards—by which names the Waldenses were commonly designated in Germany, from their abounding in the

* Item dicunt; omnia verba Missæ, et omnia præparamenta ad Missam spectantia, esse de errore, præter verba consecrationis. Ind. Error. Vald. p. 340.

neighbouring province of Picardy—confesses, with horror, that "they blaspheme the priesthood of Christ, styling the presbyters in the Church of God, by way of mockery and derision, god-makers. Nevertheless, the priests themselves make not God; but only, through the words of consecration instituted by Christ, under the species of bread and wine, mixed with water, they make our Lord Christ to be corporeally present, who was not corporeally present before, the Holy Spirit operating the transubstantiation of this oblation so as to make God."

Here, then, we have a Popish exposition of what is Popish doctrine, and an unquestionable testimony to its specific rejection by the Waldenses of the thirteenth century.

Somewhat similar is the Protestant evidence of Birkbeck for this age. The terror of the stake, the inquisition, and undistinguishing massacre, which were all brought to bear upon opponents, prevented much being written, and effectually disposed of whatever was. It is, therefore, only a few occasional acknowledgments which are, in this age, to be found; but they are conclusive against the antiquity of the doctrine which, in 1215, the Council of Lateran, by its decrees, inflicted upon the Church, in the day when Christianity was eclipsed, and the Sun of Righteousness hidden.

In this century lived John Duns Scotus, an Englishman, who was called *the Subtle Doctor*. With respect to our subject he writes: "Concerning the Eucharist, it was not in the beginning so manifestly believed as concerning this conversion.* But principally this seemeth to move us to hold transubstantiation, because, concerning the sacraments, we are to hold as the Church of Rome doth."† And he addeth, "We must say the

* Scotus, lib. 4. Dist. 10. quæst. 1. Sect. Quantum ergo ad istum argument.

† Principaliter autem videtur me movere quod de Sacramentis tenendum est, sicut tenet. S. Romana Ecclesia; nunc autem ipsa tenet panem transubstantiari in corpus, et vinum in sanguinem, sicut manifeste habetur extravagante de Summa Trinit. et fide cath. firmiter credimus Ecclesia declaravit istum intellectum esse de veritate fidei in illo symbolo edito sub Innocentio tertio in Concilio Lateranensi, et si quæras quare voluit Ecclesia eligere istum difficilem intellectum hujus articuli, cum verba scripturæ possent salvari secundùm intellectum facilem, et veriorem secundum apparentiam: dico,

Church, in the Creed of the Lateran Council, under Innocent III., which begins with these words, *Firmiter credimus*, declared this sense concerning transubstantiation to belong to the verity of our faith. And, if you demand why would the Church make choice of so difficult a sense of this article, when the words of the Scripture, 'This is my body,' might be upholden after an easy sense, and in appearance more true? I say, the Scriptures were expounded by the same Spirit that made them: and so it is to be supposed that the Catholic Church expounded them by the same Spirit whereby the faith was delivered us, namely, being taught by the Spirit of truth, and therefore it chose this sense, because it was true. Thus far Scotus.

"Let us now see what Bellarmine saith: 'Scotus tells us,' saith he, 'that before the Council of Lateran (which was held in the year 1215), transubstantiation was not believed as a point of faith;' this is confessed by Bellarmine to be the opinion of Scotus: only he would avoid his testimony with a *minime probandum est*.* Scotus, indeed, saith so, but I cannot allow of it; and then he taxeth Scotus with want of reading, as if this learned and subtle doctor had not seen as many councils, and read as many Fathers, for his time, as Bellarmine.

"The same Bellarmine saith, that Scotus held 'that there was no one place of Scripture so express, which (without the declaration of the Church) would evidently compel a man to admit of transubstantiation: and this (saith the cardinal) is not altogether improbable, that there is no express place of Scripture to prove transubstantiation without the declaration of the Church (as Scotus said); for, although the fore-cited Scripture seem to us so plain, that it may compel any but a refractory man to believe it, yet it may justly be doubted whether the text be clear enough to enforce it, seeing most acute and learned men, such as Scotus

quod eo spirtu expositæ sunt Scripturæ, quo conditæ; et ita supponendum est quod Ecclesia Cath. eo modo exposuit, quo tradidit nobis fides Sp. sancto veritatis edocta; et ideo hunc intellectum elegit, quia verus.—Scotus in 4. Sentent. Dist. 11. quæst. 3.

* Bellar. l. 3. de Sacram. Eucharist. c. 23. Sect. Unum.

was, have thought the contrary.'* Thus far Bellarmine, unto whom I will add the testimony of Cuthbert Tonstall, the learned Bishop of Durham.

"His words are these: 'Of the manner and means of the real presence, either by transubstantiation or otherwise, perhaps it had been better to leave every man that would be curious to his own conjecture, as before the Council of Lateran it was left;'† and Master Bernard Gilpin, a man most holy and renowned among the northern English, and one that was well acquainted with the Bishop Tonstall, his kinsman and diocesan, saith: 'I remember that Bishop Tonstall often told me that Pope Innocent III. had done very unadvisedly in that he made the opinion of transubstantiation an article of faith, seeing, in former times, it was free to hold or refuse that opinion.'‡

"The same bishop told me, and many times ingenuously confessed, that Scotus was of opinion that 'the Church might better, and with more ease, make use of some more commodious exposition of those words in the Holy Supper: and the bishop was of the mind that we ought to speak reverently of the Holy Supper, but that the opinion of transubstantiation might well be let alone. This thing, also, the same Bishop Tonstall was wont to affirm, both in words and writings, that Innocent III. knew not what he did when he put transubstantiation among the articles of faith; and he said that Innocentius wanted learned men about him; and,

* Dicit Scotus, non extare locum Scripturæ tam expressum, ut sine Ecclesiæ declaratione evidenter cogat transubstantiationem admittere. Atque id non est omninò improbabile. Nam etiamsi Scriptura quam nos suprà adduximus, videatur nobis tam clara, ut possit cogere hominem non protervum; tamen an ita sit, meritò dubitari potest, cùm homines doctissimi, et acutissimi, qualis imprimis Scotus fuit, contrarium sentiant.—Id. ibid. Sect. 2.

† An satius autem fuisset curiosis omnibus imposuisse silentium, ne scrutarentur modum quo id fieret—an verò potius de modo quo id fieret, curiosum quemque suæ relinquere conjecturæ, sicut liberum fuit ante illud Concilium, mòdo veritatem corporis et sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia esse fateretur, quæ fuit ab initio ipsa Ecclesiæ fides.—Tonstall. de Eucharistia, lib. 1. p. 46.

‡ Memini Tonstallum Episcopum sæpiùs narrasse Innocentium tertium inconsultiùs fecisse, quod transubstantiationis opinionem articulum fidei fecisset. Quum anteâ liberum fuisset vel sic vel aliter sentire.—Vita Bernardi Gilpini, p. 40.

indeed,' saith the bishop, 'if I had been of his counsel, I make no doubt but I might have been able to have dissuaded him from that resolution.'*

"By this that hath been said, it appears that transubstantiation was neither holden nor known universally in the Church before the Lateran Council, twelve hundred years after Christ: and that, when it began to be received as a matter of faith, it was but believed upon the Church's authority; and this Church virtually and in effect was Pope Innocent in the Lateran Council, twelve hundred years and more after Christ; before which time there was no certainty, nor necessity of believing it; and the council might have chosen another sense of Christ's words more easy, and in all appearance more true, there being no Scripture sufficient to convince it."

In the fourteenth century, learning, which, in the preceding five hundred years, had been declining or dead, began again to revive; though it must be confessed that the impetus which it was likely to receive from other sources, was largely impeded by the determined spirit of persecution which still raged against all opponents or impugners of the "true faith;" viz., that of the pope and his cardinals. The evidence of a contrary belief to that of the dominant party, is still to be sought in the works of the favourers of Rome. I am indebted, to the same source as before, for the following epitome of the traces of Protestant doctrine in this century; and I fear that the research of the last two centuries has not brought much more to light:

In this age, William of Oakham, a scholar of Duns Scotus, and educated at Merton College, Oxford, wrote boldly against the

* Ita ut Scotus (quod et Episcopus Tunstallus sæpe numero ingenuè fatebatur) existimaret; multo melius faciliusque potuisse Ecclesiam uti commodiore interpretatione verborum in sacra cœna. Reverentèr cum antiquis patribus de sacra Cœna loquendum judicavit Episcopus, et transubstantiationis opinionem mittendam esse. Illud etiam idem Tunstallus ex scriptis et sermonibus affirmare solebat, Innocentium tertium nescisse quid ageret, quando transubstantiationem inter articulos fidei posuerit: dicebatque Innocentium doctis circa se hominibus caruisse: adeo equidem, inquit Tunstallus, si ipse fuissem ei à consilio, non dubito me potuisse Pontificem ab eo consilio retraxisse.—Vita Ber. Gilpini, p. 46.

pope, in his assumptions of temporal power, and occasionally gives expression to his views on doctrinal subjects. Now, although he does not himself, in so many words, condemn the Romish doctrine, yet he tells us, plainly enough, that there was a great variety of opinion in his day. His words are: "There are three opinions of transubstantiation, of which the first supposeth a conversion of the sacramental elements; the second, an annihilation; the third affirmeth the bread to be in such sort transubstantiated into the body of Christ, that it is no way changed in substance, or substantially converted into Christ's body, or doth cease to be; but only that the body of Christ, in every part of it, becomes present in every part of the bread. This opinion, he saith, the Master of Sentences mentioneth, not much disliking it; yet it is not commonly holden."*

Now, although Oakham affirms that "*quod in altari est verum corpus Christi*,"† yet coming to treat of that *modus* or way which holds, that *substantia panis manet*, the substance of bread doth still remain in the sacrament, he saith *Hoc dogma est minoribus incommodis obnoxium*, this doctrine is subject to lesser inconveniences; *et rationi et Scripturis minus repugnans*, and is not so repugnant to reason, and to the holy Scriptures; so as *modus hic potest teneri*, this way, saith he, may be maintained,‡ *quia non repugnat rationi, nec alicui auctoritati Bibliæ*, because it is not repugnant to reason nor the Scriptures. Nay, it is, saith he, *rationabilior et facilior*, easier to be conceived, and more reasonable, and fewer inconveniences thence ensue than upon any other manner of presence. *Quia tamen doctores tenent, quod ibi non remaneat substantia panis, ideo etiam teneo;* yet, because the doctors are of opinion that the substance of bread doth not there remain, I do, therefore, hold the same with them; where any man may plainly see which way himself inclined, had he not been overruled by the contrary definition of the Roman Church. And

* Occham. Centilog. conclus. 39.
† Occham in Centilog. Theologic. conclus. lib. iv., qu. 6.
‡ Occham in 4. Sent. Dist. 11. qu. 6.

the like may be said of Petrus de Alliaco, who speaks *verbatim*, in a manner the same with Ockham, but in a fuller accent."

Durandus, who, in this century, was bishop of Meaux, gives it as his opinion, "that the material part of the consecrated bread was not converted;"* insomuch that Bellarmine professeth, "that saying of Durand is heretical, although he is no heretic, because he is ready to submit to the judgment of the Church;" where it is evident enough, from the censure of Bellarmine, that the doctrine of Durand himself was not the doctrine of the Church of Rome. But Durand says, moreover, "It is great rashness to say, that the body of Christ cannot, by divine power, be in the sacrament, but by converting bread into it.† Howbeit, if that way which supposeth bread to remain were indeed true, many doubts which meet us, holding it not to remain, were dissolved. But, forasmuch as this way must not, *de facto*, be holden, since the Church hath determined the contrary, which is presumed not to err in such matters, therefore I answer the arguments made to the contrary, holding the other part which saith, the bread is changed." Such was the support afforded, or rather the resistance which was quietly offered, to the doctrine decreed as divine by the Lateran Council in 1215.

Next comes the great light of the fourteenth century in England, the indomitable Wickliffe. It is unnecessary to do more than give a short extract or two from the voluminous writings of this illustrious man, the brightest star in the dawn of the Reformation in England. He tells us, "that friers perverten the right faith of the sacrament of the auter, and bringen in a new heresie of an accident withouten subject; and whence Holy Writ sayes openly, that this sacrament is bread that we breaken, and God's body; they sayen, that it is nother bread nor God's body, but accident withouten subject, and nought; and thus they leaven Holy Writ, and taken new heresie on Christ and his apostles, and on Austine, Jerome, Ambrose, Isidore, and other saints, and the

* Durand. 4. Dist. 11. qu. 1. † In 4 Dist. 11. qu. 1. num. 14.

Court of Rome, and all true Christian men, that holden the faith of the Gospel." Now, for his own opinion, he expresseth it in these terms,* that the body of Christ was really and truly in the sacrament, in his kind; that is, *sacramentaliter et figuraliter*, by way of sacrament; and figuratively, to wit,† as St. John Baptist figuratively was Elias, and not personally. So he saith of the consecrated host,‡ that it was Christ's body in figure, and true bread in nature; or, which is all one, true bread naturally, and Christ's body figuratively. And Wickliffe is very confident in his opinion; for he saith, "that the third part of the clergy of England would be ready to defend the same, upon pain of losing of their lives, *cum non fuerit materia martyrii plus laudanda*, there being no better cause of martyrdom."§

Similarly, in the fifteenth century, we find the following testimonies to the fact, that at that time there was no such unanimity of sentiment on the the subject of transubstantiation as the Papists allege:‖

"1. Waldensis saith, 'That some supposed the conversion that is in the sacrament to be, in that the bread and wine are assumed into the unity of Christ's person: some thought it to be, by way of imagination, and some by way of figurative and tropical appellation.'¶

"The first and second of these opinions found the better entertainment in some men's minds, because they grant the essential presence of Christ's body, and yet deny not the presence of the bread still remaining to sustain the appearing accidents.

"These opinions he reports to have been very acceptable to many, not without sighs, wishing the Church had decreed, that men should

* Iste panis est bene, verè, et realiter, spiritualiter, virtualiter, et sacramentaliter corpus Christi. Wickliff. Confessio de Sacram. Eucharist.

† Sicut Johannes Baptista figuraliter fuit Elias, et non personaliter. Art. 4. in Synod. Constant. damnatus.

‡ Est verus panis naturaliter, et corpus Christi figuraliter, Art. 49. Oxon. damnatus.

§ Confess. de Sacram. Anglicè.

‖ Birkbeck's Prot. Evid., Cent. 15, Art. 5.

¶ Primi conversionem istam per viam identificationis suppositorum efficiunt; secundi, per viam Impanationis: tertii, per viam appellationis figuralis et tropicæ, cum quibus concurrit Wicliff. Via impanationis in tantum placuit Guidoni, ut si foret Papa ipsam decerneret eligendam. Tho. Waldensis de Sacram. Euchar. cap. 64. tom. 2.

follow one of them. Whereupon John Paris writeth, 'That this way of impanation so pleased Guido, the Carmelite, sometime reader of the Holy Palace, that he professed, if he had been pope, he would have prescribed and commanded the embracing of it.'

"2. Petrus de Alliaco, the cardinal, professeth that, for ought he can see, the substantial conversion of the sacramental elements into the body and blood of Christ, cannot be proved either out of Scripture, or any determination of the universal Church, and maketh it but a matter of opinion, inclining rather to the other opinion of consubstantiation.* His words are these: 'That manner or meaning which supposeth the substance of bread to remain still, is possible; neither is it contrary to reason, or to the authority of the Scriptures; nay, it is more easy and more reasonable to conceive, than that which says the substance doth leave the accidents.'† And of this opinion no inconvenience doth seem to ensue, if it could accord with the Church's determination. And he adds: 'That the opinion which holdeth the substance of bread not to remain, doth not evidently follow of the Scripture, nor in his seeming of the Church's determination.'

"3. Biel saith, 'It is not expressed in the canon of the Bible how the body of Christ is in the sacrament;'‡ and hereof anciently there have been divers opinions.

And, although our author alleges an obligation to believe "that the bread doth not remain, but is changed into Christ's body," yet he gives as the reason, *propter Ecclesiæ determinationem in concilio Lateransi.* It is sufficiently plain, whether we should be more influenced by what he declares of scriptural teaching, or by that of the Lateran Council.

"4. Cajetan saith, 'That, secluding the Church's authority, there is no written word of God sufficient to enforce a Christian to receive this doctrine (of transubstantiation).'§

"Suarez, the Jesuit, ingenuously professeth, that Cardinal Cajetan,

* Cameracens. in 4. Sent. quæst. 6. art. 2. licet ita esse non sequatur evidenter, ex Scripturâ.

† Patet quod ille modus sit possibilis, nec repugnat rationi, nec authoritati Bibliæ, imò facilior ad intelligendum, et rationabilior quàm, &c. Ibid.

‡ Non invenitur expressum in Canone Bibliæ, unde de hoc antiquitus fuerunt diversæ opinionis. Biel in Canon. Missæ. lect. 40.

§ Dico autem ab Ecclesiâ, quum non appare at ex evangelio coactivum aliquid ad intelligendum hæc verba propriè. Cajet. in 3. part, Thom. qu. 75. art. 1.

in his commentary upon this article, did affirm that those words of Christ, 'This is my body,' do not of themselves sufficiently prove transubstantiation, without the Church's authority: and therefore, by the commandment of Pius Quintus, that part of his commentary is left out in the Roman edition.*

"By this it appears that their learned council of schoolmen, who lived in this age, were not fully agreed upon the point.

This evidence of the wide-spread existence of Protestant views on the Eucharistic question, and of the then recent decision of the Lateran Council, for the first time binding transubstantiation, is chiefly from Roman Catholic sources. It will be seen, from many of these testimonies, that the writers themselves regret the decision which bound men's consciences, and that, too, without any scriptural warrant. It will be seen, by the results of the ecclesiastical contests of the following century, that men's minds were not to be fettered even by the decree of a council, so as to be compelled to receive dogmas as divine, which had only human authority. Where is the foundation for the pretence that the Romish tenet of transubstantiation has the sanction of the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum?* It is easy to set up claims; but such as these, when investigated, "flit like the baseless fabric of a vision, and leave not a wreck behind."

Though it, perhaps, scarcely comes legitimately within the range of the fifteenth century, yet I think the following will find a better place here than later. Though actually penned in the following age, it had its existence ages before, among the primitive people of whom we have above spoken. In this respect it differs from the ordinary class of Protestant confessions, which shall be noticed in the following chapter. The reflex character of this confession is thus stated by Faber, in his history of the people from whom it comes:

* Ex Catholicis solus Cajetanus in Commentario hujus articuli qui jussu Pii V., in Romanâ editione expunctus est, docuit, seclusâ, ecclesiæ authoritate verba illa ad veritatem hanc confirmandam non sufficere. Suarez. tom. 3. Disp. 46. sec. tertio. qu. 75. in tertiam part. D. Thom.

The Vallenses of Piedmont, in the year 1542, presented to the King of France a document, preserved by Crispin, to which there is a peculiarity attached which renders it eminently valuable.

In the year 1342, a date brought out by the specification of two centuries before the year 1542, a colony of the Vallenses of Piedmont planted themselves at Merindol and Cabriere, on the western side of the Cottian Alps, and there, by dint of hard labour, brought an uninhabited desert into a state of such high cultivation, that they supplied all Provence with corn, wine, oil, honey, almonds, flocks, and herds.*

Such being the case, their confession may justly be viewed, as connecting the latter part of the middle ages with the times of the Reformation: for it may be considered as exhibiting the faith of the Vallenses on either side of the Cottian Alps, through a period of two entire centuries; or, from the year 1342, when the emigration took place, down to the year 1542, when the confession was drawn up and delivered to the French king by Cardinal Sadolet.

Of this confession the following is an extract:

"We believe and confess,† that our Lord Jesus Christ afterward ordained the sacrament of the supper, which is the giving of thanks, and the remembrance of the death and passion of Jesus Christ, rightly celebrated in the assembly of God's people. There

* Crispin. Act. et Moniment. Martyr. lib. iii. fol. 88, 100, 110.

† Credimus et confitemur, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum deinde ordinasse sacramentum Cœnæ, quæ gratiarum est actio, et memoria mortis ac passionis Jesu Christi, in cœtu populi Dei rite celebrata. In quo quidem panis et vinum distribuuntur et sumuntur, ut visibilia signa et monumenta rerum sacrarum: corporis videlicet et sanguinis Jesu Christi suspensi atque in cruce oblati pro peccatorum nostrorum remissione, et generis humani cum Deo reconciliatione. Quisque credit Jesum Christum, tradidisse corpus suum, et profudisse sanguinem, ad remissionem peccatorum; ille comedit carnem e bibit sanguinem Domini, et utriusque fit particeps: considerans convenientiam earum rerum quæ oculis subjiciuntur et cibi quo corpus istud sustentatur, cum iis, rebus quæ non videntur atque cibo spirituali. Etenim, ut corpus in hac vita pane corroboratur, vinumque cor hominis recreat; ita etiam corpus Jesu Christi morti traditum, ejusque sanguis pro nobis effusus, nutrit, confirmat, et reficit animam tristem et afflictam. Cœterum nequis existimet, signum visibile, cum re per id significata quæ est invisibilis, adeo conjungi aut conglutinari, ut disjungi aut dissolvi nequeant, quin unum sine altero esse possit. Nam Judas signum quidem cepit, rem

the bread and wine are distributed and taken, as visible signs and representations of holy things; that is to say, of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, offered upon the cross for the remission of our sins, and for the reconciliation of mankind with God. Whosoever believeth that Jesus Christ delivered His body and shed His blood for the remission of sins, he eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the Lord, and becomes a partaker of both, considering the agreement of those things which are subjected to the eyes, and of the food by which the body is sustained, with those things which are not seen, and with spiritual food. For as the body, in this life, is strengthened with bread, and as wine recreates the heart of man, so likewise the body of Jesus Christ, delivered unto death, and His blood shed for us, nourish and confirm and refresh the sad and afflicted soul. But let not any one imagine, that the visible sign is so conjoined or conglutinated with the invisible thing signified, as to be incapable of separation; insomuch that the one cannot be received without the other: for Judas, indeed, received the sign; but the thing signified he did not receive, nor was he ever made a partaker of the body and blood of Christ. The opinion of some, therefore, is not to be received, who believe, that the true and natural body of Christ, His flesh and His bones, exist and lie hid in that bread of the supper, or that any transmutation of the one into the other is effected. For this opinion is repugnant to the word of God and contrary to the articles of our faith, in which it is clearly set forth, that Christ ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right

vero significatam et fructum non percepit, nec unquam corporis et sanguinis Jesu Christi particeps factus est.—Atqui istud non eo modo accipiendum quo nonnulli opinati sunt, verum Christi corpus et naturale, carnem et ossa, in pane illo Cœnæ esse ac delitescere, aut in eum converti; nam hæc opinio pugnat cum verbo Dei, et fidei nostræ articulis est contraria, in quibus clarè habemus, Christum ascendisse ad cœlos, sedere ad dextram Dei Patris omnipotentis, unde et venturus est ad judicandum vivos et mortuos; sed Dominus Jesus Christus sacramento Cœnæ adest, potentia, virtute, atque præsentia, Spiritus sui, in cordibus electorum suorum et fidelium.—Errant etiam, qui affirmant, in Cœna Christi corpus comedi corporaliter: caro enim nihil prodest; Spiritus est, qui vivificat. Fideles igitur verè Jesu Christi carnem edunt et sanguinem bibunt spiritualiter in ipsorum cordibus. Confess. Vald. in Crispin. Act. Martyr. lib. iii. 106—108.

hand of God the Father Almighty; whence, also, He will come to judge the quick and the dead. But the Lord Jesus Christ is present in the sacrament of the supper, by the power, and virtue, and presence of His Spirit in the hearts of His elect and faithful. They, also, who affirm that in the supper the body of Christ is eaten corporally, do err: for the flesh, when eaten, profiteth nothing; it is the Spirit which quickeneth. Therefore, the truly faithful of Jesus Christ eat His flesh and drink His blood spiritually in their hearts."*

I shall now proceed to consider the mighty change which took place, in the early part of the sixteenth century, in the state of the Christian Church throughout Christendom. It was one of the most extensive revolutions of opinion which the world ever saw brought about in so short a time, and by such unlikely means. But "man's extremity is God's opportunity," and the feebleness and unsuitableness (to human eye) of the instrumentality, only demonstrates the more clearly the origin of the potent influence. The use of "earthen vessels" teaches that the power is of God, and not of man.

* Faber's Hist. of Vall. and Alb. bk. iii., c. xi.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HARMONY OF PROTESTANT CONFESSIONS ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

We have now arrived at that epoch in the Church's history, when, being blinded by the darkest errors in her faith, she had sunk into the lowest depths of viciousness and infamy in her practice. But the hour of Nature's deepest obscurity—when "Night is in the zenith of her dark domain"—is that wherein the sun begins his return journey to gladden our hearts, and enlighten our eyes. Nor was it otherwise with the night of the Church. When it might have seemed to the superficial ken that all was lost, then did it please God that the discovery of printing should give wings, as it were, to banished knowledge, that she might fly to and fro, and bless the soul of man. That "solitary monk, who shook the world," was, perhaps, the least likely of all instruments to work such a vast change as that which he was the means of accomplishing; or, at least, in the advance of which he led the way. No one can now look back upon the history of those days, and not feel that Luther was just the man for the emergency, though singled out from amongst those whom he afterwards so strenuously opposed. He was unlikely, considering his profession, his position, his probable opportunities. But wherein he lacked any of these things, the pope opened the way for him. His suitableness is seen, in the steady coolness with which he braved all hostility and danger, and the unflinching firmness with which he held to the opinions which he was led to adopt. The suitableness of the instruments used, will generally be seen by

imagining any two prominent individuals transposed. If Cranmer had been in Luther's place, the Reformation would have been swamped: if Luther had occupied Cranmer's position, he would, probably, soon have forfeited it, or have shaken too violently the Church in so much more limited a sphere. We see the suitableness—we admire the adaptation. A wise Head, and a powerful Hand, are here plainly seen to be at work: one less wise, less powerful, would mar the whole, and throw it into confusion. With regard to all *God's* works, we may safely say, not only "whatever is, is right," but "whatever is, is *best*."

But it would have been impossible for even Luther to have created such a wide-spread, deeply-rooted perturbation of opinion, had it not been that men's minds were prepared, nay, longing for the change. The train was laid, and it needed only the match to produce the explosion. The testimonies which have been presented to us of the foregoing centuries, prove this clearly enough. Means, at the thought of which the soul shudders, had been unscrupulously used to stem heresy and silence heretics, as the dominant party phrased it, but in fact to get rid of opposition and crush the truth. Now, that *one* dared to speak out, as well as think, others took courage, and imparted what they took. Alone, undoubtedly, even Luther would have been overwhelmed, but when thousands were heard to re-echo his words, the adversary was staggered as well as intimidated.

And the *identity* of the movement proves the unity of its source. There has never yet been a controversial writer or speaker, on the side of Rome, but has always upbraided the Protestants with the variations of their creed; but this opprobrium is much more imaginary than real. In fact, the Reformation was *the same work* wherever it was entered upon. In the different nations of Europe, and even in the same nation among different bodies, the degrees varied to which the Reformation was pushed. But in no case has Rome ought to boast of in this; for she is equally condemned by all, though *not quite* to the same extent. There is, however, scarcely a shadow of disparity in the

doctrines and practices censured by the various bodies of Protestants, but they unanimously condemn what are familiarly known as the peculiar doctrines of Popery. Now, whence could this unanimity spring if not hence; viz., that the whole body of protestors had derived their creed from the same origin? To suppose that, in a time of agitation and violent controversy, none should have exceeded the bounds of moderation, would be to ignore the essential characteristics of human nature: to suppose that so much agreement could result from simple chance-medley and mental confusion, is equally to forget the connection of cause and effect. There is enough of family likeness existing in the several branches of the Protestant communities, to shew, manifestly enough, that they are brethren. The close accordance between their several sentiments and the revealed word of God, puts it beyond all doubt, that *that* is the source whence their faith has been derived. "The Harmony of the Protestant Confessions" is carried out into too many particulars to allow *chance* to have had anything to do in their composition.

In the "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," there is again served up the old, oft-repudiated, as well as oft-refuted figment, that Luther and Calvin, and Zuinglius and Cranmer, were of essentially different opinions on matters of religion. It is true, indeed, that they did not agree together in every idea, any more than other men; but the attempt to demonstrate three different, and all erroneous, systems on the single subject of the Eucharist, held by so many distinct classes of Protestants, is almost wholly imaginary. No doubt, in *all* churches, Protestant and Romish, there is a great difference of opinion about the nature and efficacy of the Eucharist as an ordinance, and of the elements as external symbols; but I do not find that there is any good ground for this distinction in the examination of the various confessions which have been promulgated by the different Protestant churches. I shall give that portion of these which has special reference to the subject which has so long engaged our attention; and I think that, when these extracts have been read, considered, and compared,

the conviction will be that they teach generally the same doctrine, and that it must have been derived from the same source. I have used them, as prepared to my hand in "The Harmony of Protestant Confessions," from the accurate and valuable edition of Mr. Hall.* They are given, in chronological order, as follows:

OF THE HOLY SUPPER OF THE LORD.

I.—FROM THE LATTER CONFESSION OF HELVETIA.

Chapter 12. *Of the Holy Supper of the Lord.*

The Latter Confession of Helvetia was written by the pastors of Zurich, in the year 1566, and approved and subscribed, not only of the Tigurines themselves, and their confederates of Berne, Schaffhausen, Sangallia, Rhetia, Mulhausen, and Bienne; but by the churches of Geneva, of Savoy, of Poland, and likewise of Hungary, and of Scotland.

The Supper of the Lord (which is also called the Lord's Table, and the Eucharist—that is, a thanksgiving) is, therefore, commonly called a supper because it was instituted of Christ in that His last Supper, and doth as yet represent the same, and in it the faithful are spiritually fed and nourished. For the author of the Supper of the Lord is not an angel or a man, but the very Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who did first of all consecrate it to His Church. And the same blessing and consecration doth still remain amongst all those who celebrate no other but that very Supper, which the Lord did institute; and at that do recite the words of the Supper of the Lord, and in all things look unto Christ only by a true faith; at whose hands, as it were, they do receive that which they do receive by the ministry of the ministers of the Church. The Lord, by this sacred rite, would have that great benefit to be kept in fresh remembrance, which He did for mankind; to wit, that, by giving up His body to death,

* The Harmony of Protestant Confessions: exhibiting the Faith of the Churches of Christ, reformed after the pure and holy doctrine of the Gospel, throughout Europe. By the Rev. Peter Hall, M.A.

and shedding His blood, He hath forgiven us all our sins, and redeemed us from eternal death, and the power of the devil, and doth now feed us with His flesh, and giveth us His blood to drink, which things, being apprehended spiritually by a true faith, do nourish us up to life everlasting. And this, so great a benefit, is renewed, so oft as the Supper is celebrated. For the Lord said, "Do this in remembrance of me" (*Luke* xxii., 19).

By this holy Supper, also, it is sealed unto us, that the very body of Christ was truly given up for us, and His blood shed for the remission of our sins, lest that our faith might somewhat waver. And this is outwardly represented unto us, by the minister, in the sacrament, after a visible manner; and, as it were, laid before our eyes to be seen, which is inwardly in the soul invisibly performed by the Holy Ghost. Outwardly, bread is offered by the minister, and the words of the Lord are heard: "Receive, eat, this is my body; take it, and divide it amongst you: drink ye all of this, this is my blood" (*Matt.* xxvi., 26—28; *Luke* xxii., 17—20). Therefore the faithful do receive that which is given by the minister of the Lord, and do eat the bread of the Lord, and drink of the Lord's cup. But yet, by the working of Christ, through the Holy Ghost, they receive also the flesh and blood of the Lord, and do feed on them to life everlasting. For the flesh and blood of Christ are true meat and drink unto everlasting life: yea, Christ Himself, in that He was delivered for us, and is our Saviour, is that special thing and substance of the Supper; and, therefore, we suffer nothing to be put in His place.

But that it may the better and more plainly be understood, how the flesh and blood of Christ are the meat and drink of the faithful, and are received by the faithful to life everlasting, we will add, moreover, these four things.

Eating is of divers sorts: for there is a corporal eating, whereby meat is taken into a man's mouth, chewed with the teeth, and swallowed down into the belly. After this manner did the Capernaites, in times past, think that they should eat the flesh of the Lord: but they are confuted by him (*John* vi., 30—63). For as

the flesh of Christ cannot be eaten bodily, without great wickedness and cruelty, so is it not meat for the belly, as all men do confess. We, therefore, disallow that canon in the pope's decrees, *Ego Berengarius; De Consecrat. dist.* 2. For neither did godly antiquity believe, neither yet do we believe, that the body of Christ can be eaten corporally, and essentially, with a bodily mouth.

There is also a spiritual eating of Christ's body; not such a one, whereby it may be thought that the very meat is changed into the Spirit, but whereby (the Lord's body and blood remaining in their own essence and property) those things are spiritually communicated unto us, not after a corporal, but after a spiritual manner, through the Holy Ghost, who doth apply and bestow upon us those things (to wit, remission of sins, deliverance, and life everlasting) which are prepared for us by the flesh and blood of our Lord, given for us: so that Christ doth now live in us, and we live in Him; and doth cause us to apprehend Him by true faith, to this end, that He may become unto us such a spiritual meat and drink—that is to say, our life. For even as corporal meat and drink do not only refresh and strengthen our bodies, but also do keep them in life: even so the flesh of Christ delivered for us, and His blood shed for us, do not only refresh and strengthen our souls, but also do preserve them alive, not so far as they be corporally eaten and drunken, but so far as they are communicated unto us spiritually by the Spirit of God:* the Lord saying, "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (*John* vi., 51). Also, "The flesh (to wit, corporally eaten) profiteth nothing; it is the Spirit which giveth life: and the words which I speak to you, are Spirit and life" (*John* vi., 63). And as we must, by eating, receive the

* The adverb *so far as*, understand to be used casually, for *because*; as if he had said, not that they be eaten corporally, &c. But in this place, and other places elsewhere afterward, so understand these adverbs *corporally*, and *spiritually*, that by them not the thing signified, which is received, but the manner of receiving it, is declared, namely, to be not corporal, but spiritual; that is, not of the external mouth, but of the faithful mind.

meat into our bodies, to the end that it may work in us, and shew its efficacy in us (because, while it is without us, it profiteth us not at all); even so it is necessary that we receive Christ by faith, that He may be made ours, and that He may live in us, and we in Him. For He saith, "I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me, shall not thirst any more" (*John* vi., 35); and also, "He that eateth me, shall live through me; and he abideth in me, and I in him" (*John* vi., 56). By all which it appeareth manifestly, that by spiritual meat we mean not any imaginary thing, but the very body of our Lord Jesus, given to us; which yet is received of the faithful, not corporally, but spiritually, by faith: in which point we do wholly follow the doctrine of our Lord and Saviour, Christ, in the sixth of John. And this eating of the flesh, and drinking of the blood of the Lord, is so necessary to salvation, that without it no man can be saved. This spiritual eating and drinking is also without the Supper of the Lord, even so often as, and wheresoever, a man doth believe in Christ. To which purpose that sentence of St. Austin doth happily belong: "Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten."

Besides that former spiritual eating, there is a sacramental eating of the body of the Lord; whereby the faithful man not only is partaker, spiritually and internally, of the true body and blood of the Lord; but also, by coming to the table of the Lord, doth outwardly receive the visible sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord. True it is, that the faithful man, by believing, did before receive the food that giveth life, and still receiveth the same; but yet, when he receiveth the sacrament, he receiveth something more. For he goeth on in continual communication of the body and blood of the Lord, and his faith is daily more and more kindled, more strengthened and refreshed, by the spiritual nourishment. For while we live, faith hath continual increasings; and he that outwardly doth receive the sacraments with a true faith, the same doth not only receive the sign, but also doth enjoy (as we have said) the thing itself. Moreover, the same man

doth obey the Lord's institution and commandment, and, with a joyful mind, giveth thanks for his, and the redemption of all mankind, and maketh a faithful remembrance of the Lord's death, and doth witness the same before the Church, of which body he is a member. This also is sealed to those which receive the sacrament, that the body of the Lord was given, and His blood shed, not only for men in general, but particularly for every faithful communicant, whose meat and drink He is, to life everlasting. But as for him that, without faith, cometh to this holy table of the Lord, he is made partaker of the sacrament only; but the matter of the sacrament, from whence cometh life and salvation, he receiveth not at all: and such men do unworthily eat of the Lord's table. "Now, they which do unworthily eat of the Lord's bread, and drink of the Lord's cup, they are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and they eat and drink it to their judgment" (1 *Cor.* xi., 26—29). For when, as they do not approach with true faith, they do despite unto the death of Christ, and therefore eat and drink condemnation to themselves.

We do not, therefore, so join the body of the Lord and His blood with the bread and wine, as though we thought that the bread is the body of Christ, more than after a sacramental manner; or that the body of Christ doth lie hid corporally under the bread, so as it ought to be worshipped under the forms of bread; or yet that whosoever he be which receiveth the sign, he receiveth the thing itself. The body of Christ is in the heavens, at the right hand of His Father: and, therefore, our hearts are to be lifted up on high, and not to be fixed on the bread, neither is the Lord to be worshipped in the bread; though, notwithstanding, the Lord is not absent from His Church, when as they celebrate the Supper. The sun, being absent from us in the heavens, is yet, notwithstanding, present amongst us effectually: how much more Christ, the Sun of righteousness, though in body He be absent from us in the heavens, yet is present amongst us, not corporally, but spiritually, by His lively operation; and so as He Himself promised, in His last Supper, to be present amongst us! (*John*

xiv., xv., and xvi). Whereupon it followeth, that we have not the Supper without Christ, and yet that we have meanwhile an unbloody and mystical Supper, even as all antiquity called it.

Moreover, we are admonished, in the celebration of the Supper of the Lord, to be mindful of the body whereof we are made members; and that therefore we be at concord with all our brethren, that we live holily, and not pollute ourselves with wickedness, and strange religions; but, persevering in the true faith to the end of our life, give diligence to excel in holiness of life. It is, therefore, very requisite, that, purposing to come to the Supper of the Lord, we do try ourselves, according to the commandment of the apostle: first, with what faith we are endued, whether we believe that Christ is come to save sinners, and to call them to repentance, and whether each man believe that he is in the number of them, that, being delivered by Christ, are saved; and whether he have purposed to change his wicked life, to live holily, and persevere, through God's assistance, in true religion, and in concord with his brethren, and to give worthy thanks to God for his delivery, &c.

We think that rite, manner, or form of the Supper to be the most simple and excellent, which cometh nearest to the first institution of the Lord, and to the apostles' doctrine: which doth consist in declaring the word of God, in godly prayers, in the action itself that the Lord used, and the repeating of it; in the eating of the Lord's body, and drinking of His blood; in the wholesome remembrance of the Lord's death, and faithful giving of thanks; and in an holy fellowship in the union of the body of the Church. We, therefore, disallow them, which have taken from the faithful one part of the sacrament, to wit, the Lord's cup. For these do very grievously offend against the institution of the Lord, who saith, "Drink all of you of this" (*Matt.* xxvi., 27), which He did not so plainly say of the bread. What manner of mass it was that the Fathers used, whether it were tolerable or intolerable, we do not now dispute. But this we say freely; that the mass, which is now used throughout the Romish Church,

which, for brevity's sake, we will not now particularly recite, for many and most just causes is quite abolished out of our Churches. Truly we could not like of it, because that, of a most wholesome action, they have made a vain spectacle; also, because it is made a meritorious matter, and is said for money; likewise, because that in it the priest is said to make the very body of the Lord, and to offer the same really, even for the remission of the sins of the quick and the dead. Add this also: that they do it for the honour, worship, and reverence of the saints in heaven, &c.

II.—FROM THE FORMER CONFESSION OF HELVETIA.

Article 22. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

The Former Confession of Helvetia was written at Basle about the year 1536, in the behalf of all the Churches of Helvetia, and sent and presented to the assembly of divines at Wirtemburg, by Master Bucer and Master Capito. In the year following—viz., 1537—it was again propounded, together with the declaration thereof, to the assembly of Smalcald, by Bucer himself, and allowed of that whole assembly; namely, of all the divines and degrees of Protestants; as Luther his own letters to the Helvetians do testify. The declaration in Latin was itself also conferred in very many places with the more ample copy, written in the German tongue.

We say that the Supper is a mystical thing, wherein the Lord doth indeed offer unto those that are His, His body and blood, that is, Himself, to this end, that He may more and more live in them, and they in Him. Not that the body and blood of the Lord are either naturally united to bread and wine, or be locally here inclosed, or be placed here by any carnal presence; but that bread and wine, by the institution of the Lord, are signs, whereby the true communication of His body and blood is exhibited of the Lord Himself, by the ministry of the Church, not to be meat for the belly, which doth perish, but to be nourishment unto eternal life. We do, therefore, use this holy meat oftentimes, because that, being admonished hereby, we do with the eyes of faith behold the flesh and blood of Christ crucified: and, meditating upon our salvation, not without a taste of heavenly life, and a true sense of life eternal, we are refreshed by this spiritual, lively, and

inward food, with an unspeakable sweetness; and we do rejoice with a joy that cannot be expressed in words, for that life which we have found; and we do wholly, and with all our strength, pour out thanksgiving for so wonderful a benefit of Christ bestowed upon us. Therefore we are most unworthily charged of some, who think that we do attribute very little to these holy signs. For these things be holy and reverend,* as those which were instituted and received of our High Priest, Christ: exhibiting unto us, after their manner, as we have said, the things signified; giving witness of the things done; representing very difficult things unto us; and, by a certain wonderful analogy of things signified, bringing light to those most evident mysteries. Moreover, they minister aid and help even to faith itself: and, to conclude, they do serve instead of an oath, to bind him that is entered into the profession of Christianity. Thus holily do we think of the sacred signs. But we do always attribute the force and virtue of quickening and sanctifying to Him, who is life itself; to whom be praise for ever: Amen.

Out of the Declaration of the same Confession :—Of the Holy Supper of the Lord.

The Supper of the Lord is a sacrament; to wit, the holy institution of the Lord, whereby He doth renew and witness unto us His bountifulness; to wit, the communion of His body and blood, and that by a visible sign. For by bread and wine He doth declare unto us what He giveth, namely, Himself, to be the nourishment of our life: for He, by His body and blood, doth feed us to life eternal. Therefore, the very gift of God (that is, the body and blood of the Lord; to wit, the body of the Lord delivered unto death for us, and His blood shed for the remission

* By *holy*, understand those things which are appointed to a most holy use; not those wherein consisteth any inherent holiness. In like manner by *reverend*, understand those things which are to be received with outward comeliness, and in that order which might testify an internal veneration; namely, when our minds are lifted up unto God: not that any worship ought to be yielded to the signs themselves, or that those rites, which are either in their own nature superstitious, or else may easily be turned into superstition, ought to be used in the holy service of the Lord.

of sins) is the chiefest part of this sacrament. For the body and blood of Christ is thus made or prepared to be the lively meat of our souls. The Son of God doth die in the flesh for us, that He might quicken us; he poureth out His blood, that He might cleanse us from our sins. To conclude, He raiseth up His body from the dead, that our bodies may receive hope, and strength to rise again. Thus, therefore, doth the Lord offer Himself to be eaten and possessed of us, and not a certain false imagination of a man, or an idle picture, in His stead. For, beside Him, there is nothing in heaven, or in earth, that may feed and satiate our souls. Now, we do indeed eat the body, and we do indeed drink the blood, of our Lord; but not so rawly, as the Papists have hitherto taught, to wit, the bread being changed into natural flesh, substantially (that is, corporally, or carnally), or the body being included in the bread; but spiritually, that is, after a spiritual manner, and with a faithful mind. The Lord is eaten indeed, and with fruit, by faith, that now He may live whole in His, and His in Him.

Moreover, these holy gifts of God (which are not given of any other than the Lord Himself), according to the institution of the Lord, are represented unto us by visible signs, to wit, bread and wine, and offered to our senses, not that we should rest in them, but that our weakness may be helped, and that we may lift up our hearts unto the Lord; knowing that here we must think upon greater things, to wit, not of eating bread, or drinking wine, but of receiving the Lord Himself, with all His gifts, by a faithful mind. Therefore, when the guests see the bread on the board, they set their minds upon the body of Christ; when they see the cup, they set their minds upon the blood of Christ: when they see the bread broken, and the wine poured out, they consider how that the body of Christ was tormented, and His blood poured out, for their sakes. As by bread the bodies are nourished and strengthened; as by wine the minds are made merry: so the godly do believe, that by the body of the Lord, delivered unto death for them, they are fed to everlasting life; and that by His

blood poured out upon the cross, their consciences are renewed. To conclude, they do feel the quickening power of Christ, which doth confirm them.

In this sort is the Supper of the Lord accomplished spiritually: thus are the bread and wine a sacrament unto us, and not bare and naked signs. Hereupon now ariseth a very great rejoicing and thanksgiving for so great benefits; also a praising and confessing of the name of God. Here those works, which the Lord once finished, are renewed and represented: but especially the memory of the Lord's death is renewed, which, although it once happened, and now is past, yet unto the faithful it is as yet fresh and present. For the remembrance of the death of Christ, which we make in the Supper, is far more noble and holy than theirs, who, in some profane banquet, are mindful of their companion, when they drink the wine that He gave them. For, among these, He that is absent worketh nothing: but in this holy Supper of the faithful the Lord is present, and doth work effectually by the Spirit in their hearts, as He who, according to His promises, is in the midst of them.

By these things it is most evident, that in the holy Supper we do not take away our Lord Christ from His Church, nor deny that His body and blood is there received to be our nourishment unto life eternal. But we, together with our predecessors, and the chief prelates of our religion did, and as yet to this day do, deny that the very body of Christ is eaten carnally, or that it is present everywhere corporally, and after a natural manner. For we do openly confess, according to the Scriptures, and with all the holy Fathers, that Jesus Christ our Lord left this world, and went to His Father: and that He now sitteth at the right hand of His Father in heavenly glory, from whence He shall never* descend, or be drawn down into this earthly and transitory world. For the true presence of Christ in the Supper is heavenly, not earthly, not carnal. Also, we deny that the bread is turned into the body

* Never, that is, under the present dispensation, or before His return, in glory and judgment, at the last day.—Editor.

of Christ miraculously, so that the bread should become the very body of Christ, naturally and substantially, yet after a spiritual manner. To conclude, we deny that the body of Christ is united with the signs, by any other than a mystical mean, whereof we have spoken sufficiently in the general consideration of a sacrament. Seeing, therefore, we have expressly said and written, with the holy Fathers—Tertullian, Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine—"that the bread is a figure, token, and sign of the body of Christ," and also, "that by bread and wine the body and blood of the Lord are signified;" this is it which we would make manifest, to wit, that the bread is not the very body of the Lord, but a token, or a sacrament of His body. And yet we do not, therefore, speak these things, as though we did simply deny all kind of presence of Christ in the Supper; for that kind of presence which now we have confessed doth remain true, without any prejudice to this sort of speeches. Moreover, the word *this*, in the sentence, "This is my body" (*Luke* xxii., 19), doth not only shew bread unto our corporal eyes, but therewith also it sheweth the very body of Christ unto the eyes of our mind.

Also, we confess that this use of the Supper is so holy and profitable, that whosoever shall worthily—that is, with a true faith—eat of this bread, and drink of this cup of the Lord, he doth receive heavenly gifts from the Lord: but "whosoever shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, unworthily"—(that is, without faith, by which alone we are made partakers of the Lord, and of salvation)—"he doth eat and drink judgment unto himself;" as Paul wrote to the Corinthians (1 *Cor.* xi., 27—29). Wherefore we do often put this diligently into the heads of our people, that they take heed that none of them abuse the Lord's table; but that every one examine himself, and then eat of that bread, and drink of that cup (1 *Cor.* xi., 28). Also, the Lord's Supper is a badge unto us; for as one loaf, and one wine, are made of many grains and grapes, so we, being the whole multitude of the faithful, are gathered together to be one bread, and one body (1 *Cor.* x., 17). By this we testify, in an outward

profession, that we are redeemed by the blood of Christ, and made the members of Christ; to whom we give thanks, in whom we are confederates, and do promise to perform mutual duties one toward another.

III.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF BASLE.

Article 6. Of the Supper of the Lord.

The Confession of Basle was first written in the German tongue, about the year 1532, by the ministers of the Church of Basle, and, by common subscription, allowed of the pastors of Strasburg. Then again, in the year 1561, it was both recognised and received by the same ministers of Basle. Afterward, also, it was published in the German tongue, with a preface, by the magistrates of Milan, in their own name, as though it had been that Church's own confession. And at last it was turned into Latin. Which, as more ancient than the rest of the confessions of Helvetia, we have thought good should be set down here also, and do sometimes call it likewise the Confession of Mulhausen.

We confess that the Lord Jesus did institute His holy Supper, that His holy passion might be remembered with thanksgiving, His death declared, and Christian charity and unity, with true faith, testified. And as in baptism (wherein the washing away of our sins is offered by the minister of the Church, and yet is wrought only by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost), true water remaineth, so, also, in the Supper of the Lord (wherein, together with the bread and wine of the Lord, the true body and the true blood of Christ is offered by the minister of the Church), bread and wine remaineth. Moreover, we do firmly believe, that Christ Himself is the meat of faithful souls unto life eternal, and that our souls, by faith in Christ crucified, are fed and moistened with the flesh and blood of Christ (*John* vi., 53); so that we, being members of His body, as of our only head (*Eph.* i., 22; iv., 15; v., 23; and *Col.* i., 18); do live in Him, and He in us; wherein, at the last day, through Him, and in Him, we shall rise again to eternal joy and blessedness (*John* xi., 25).

And, in the Marginal Note, upon the words, Our Souls:

For it is a spiritual meat, and therefore it is received of a faith-

ful soul; that is, the souls are made full, valiant, mighty, peaceable, quiet, merry, and lively to all things, as the body is by the corporal meat.

Also, upon the words, The Members of the Head:

And so man is made a spiritual member of the spiritual body of Christ.

And, in the Margin, upon the words, To be present:

To wit, sacramentally, and by a remembrance of faith, which lifteth up a man's mind to heaven, and doth not pull down Christ, according to His humanity, from the right hand of God.

Now, we do not include into the bread and drink of the Lord, the natural, pure, and substantial body of Christ, which was born of the true Virgin Mary, suffered for us, and ascended into heaven. Therefore, neither do we worship Christ in the signs of bread and wine, which we do commonly call the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, but in heaven, at the right hand of God the Father (*Col.* iii., 1; *Heb.* i., 3, and x., 12), from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead (*Acts* iii., 21; 2 *Tim.* iv., 1).

IV.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF BOHEMIA.

Chapter 13. *Of the Holy Supper of the Lord.*

The Confession of Bohemia, being the last, composed of four former, which were far more ancient (which for the largeness thereof we thought good not to be inserted into this Harmony), being recited in the same order of chapters and arguments, and somewhat more plainly expressed, and in the year 1573 published in divers places, was also approved by common testimony of the university of Wirtemburg; even as Masters Luther and Melancthon had approved the former, published in the year 1532, being altogether the same in doctrine with this, as Luther his preface witnesseth. And we have called it elsewhere the Confession of the Waldenses, following the common title assigned unto these churches; which we would have to be spoken without any prejudice to those brethren.

In the thirteenth place we teach, touching the Supper of the Lord which is in the New Testament, that we must believe with the heart, and profess with the mouth, that it is a sacrament instituted of Christ our Lord, in His last Supper, and that in

express form of words: that is, that, concerning bread and wine, he hath pronounced, that they be His body and His blood; and that they were delivered to his apostles (*Matt.* xxvi., 26—28; *Mark* xiv., 22—24; *Luke* xxii., 19, 20); and so, in like sort, to the whole universal Church, for a monument of His death, and that all men should lawfully use the participation thereof, even to the end of the world. Of this sacrament the evangelists do write, and especially St. Paul, whose words, even to this day, are thus read in the Church: "I have received of the Lord, that which I also have delivered unto you; to wit, that the Lord Jesus, in that night, wherein he was betrayed, took bread," &c. (1 *Cor.* xi. 23). And a little after: "When ye come together (to wit, to the Supper of the Lord), let one tarry for another" (*ver.* 33). Therefore, according to these things, we believe with the heart, and confess with the mouth, that this bread of the Lord's Supper is the body of the Lord Jesus Christ delivered for us; and that this cup, or the wine in the cup, is likewise His blood shed for us, for the remission of sins. And this we affirm according to the express words of Christ, wherein He saith, "This is my body, this is my blood" (*Matt.* xxvi., 26—28). Which words may not be taken or understood of any other thing, nor be otherwise referred than only to the bread and cup of the Lord: and the body and blood of the Lord cannot be understood of any other, than of the only true and proper body of Christ, which He made meat by His torments, and of His blood, which, being largely poured out of His body, He appointed to be drink for His Church. For He had not a natural body, and other blood. Therefore our ministers do teach, that to these certain words pronounced by Christ our Lord (wherein He doth peculiarly pronounce, witness, and institute bread to be His body, and wine to be His blood), I say, that to these words no man may add anything, no man may detract anything from them; but that every man, in these words, is to believe that which of themselves they signify,* and that no man ought to turn from them, either to the right hand or to the left.

* That is to say, of the true bread and wine, and also of the very body that was given for us, and of the very blood that was shed for us. As for that attribution

Yet, to expound the meaning of this faith, we do further teach, that although the bread be the body of Christ, according to His institution, and wine be His blood, yet doth neither of these leave its nature, or change or lose its substance; but that the bread is, and doth remain, bread; and that the wine is, and doth remain, wine; as also the holy Scripture doth give this its own name to either of them. Otherwise, if it should cease to be an element, it should not be a sacrament; seeing that a sacrament is then made, when the word is added to the element. *August. in Joan. Tract.* 80, *et Epist.* 23, *ad Bonifa.* Neither could it signify, or bear witness, if it had nothing instead of that thing, whereof it is a sacrament; or if the thing signified should have any other manner of presence than that which is sacramental. Wherefore this speech, "Bread is the body, and wine is the blood of Christ," is a sacramental speech; to wit, that these two distinct things do remain the self-same thing which in their own nature they be, and yet that, by reason of a sacramental union, or sacramentally, they be that also, which they do signify, and whereof they do testify; and yet not in their own nature, or after a natural manner, but by the institution, pronouncing, or witnessing of the author: as Paul doth excellently expound this, where he thus writeth, "The cup which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 *Cor.* x., 16).

Now, both the good and the wicked do use this sacrament; and yet the true believers do receive it to life, and those which do not believe do receive it to judgment and condemnation. And although either of them do receive this sacrament, and the truth thereof,*

wherein the bread is said to be the body, and wine to be the blood, even in this confession it is evidently set down, that it ought to be interpreted by a sacramental metonymy.

* By the word *truth*, in this place, understand, not the fruit of the sacraments, which is received of the faithful only; neither yet the very body and blood of Christ (seeing that they also cannot be received but by faith, to salvation); but the bread and the wine, the which (whether worthy or unworthy communicants do approach) are never, in respect of God, offered, as to be received, without the thing signified; because the truth of God dependeth not upon the worthiness or unworthiness of the communicants. Yet hereby it cannot be concluded, that both of them are received of every one, because

sacramentally and outwardly, yet the believers do alone receive it spiritually, and so to their salvation: without which spiritual receiving, there is no worthy receiving in the sacramental use. For by this mean we are ingrafted into Christ, and into His body; and by this mean is that true union and communion of Christ with His Church made: and in like sort by this mean is the communion of the holy Church, which is a certain spiritual body, made amongst and with themselves; whereof the apostle writeth, "There is one bread, and we, being many, are one body, seeing we are all made partakers of one bread" (1 *Cor.* x., 17).

Moreover, we are further taught, that with this ministry, or sacrament of the Lord, no other thing ought to be done, or taken in hand, than that one thing which was shewed, ordained, and expressly commanded of Christ Himself; as when He reached bread, severally and peculiarly, to His disciples, and in express words said, "Take, eat, this is my body;" and in like sort, when He reached to them the cup, severally and peculiarly, saying, "Drink all ye of this, this is my blood." Thus, therefore, according to this commandment, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ must be distributed only, and be received in common of the faithful, or believing Christians: but it must not be sacrificed, or set forth, or lifted up, that it may be worshipped, or exhibited, or stored away, or carried about. And both these must be received in several elements peculiarly; His body severally, and also His holy blood severally, as either of them were of the Lord severally instituted, reached forth, and given to all His disciples in common. And this doctrine was used in the first holy Church, and this sacrament was wholly distributed and received in both parts. But he that, beside or contrary to these commandments, and the institution of Christ, dare bring in any other thing, or somewhat more, and use it with this sacrament, or wantonly invent therein at his pleasure; he doth manifestly and malapertly against our Lord, who instituted this sacrament, and committeth a thing

both of them are always offered by God to all indifferently. Concerning which matter, see very fully hereafter in the first observation upon the confession of Augsburg.

clean contrary to His holy testament, and last will, which was declared in His own words, and that expressly.

Also, this sacrament ought to be received and administered without adoration, and without that worship which is due to God alone; yet with a due kind of religion and reverence, and chiefly with that which is the greatest of all, namely, with faith and examination of one's self, which in this action is most acceptable to Christ our Lord, and most profitable for men; which, also, St. Paul taught the first Church, and exhorted it hereunto, saying, "Let every man try, or examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, doth eat and drink his own judgment, or condemnation, because he discerneth not the Lord's body" (1 *Cor.* xi., 28, 29). And, in another place, "Prove yourselves, whether ye are in the faith: examine yourselves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates? Now I pray unto God, that ye do no evil" (2 *Cor.* xiii., 5—7). If so be that any man approach to this table without such a trial, and presenting of himself worthy; who hath not first examined himself, what manner of faith he hath, with what purpose he came to this sacrament, or how he had prepared himself hereunto: I say, such a man should greatly profane and reproach this sacrament, yea, the whole institution hereof appointed by Christ. For which cause the ministers of our churches do admit none to this sacrament, neither give it unto any, but to such as are noted to come unto it seriously, and do, so much as in them lieth, prepare themselves hereunto after such a manner as becometh Christian godliness.

Now, when the congregation doth come together to celebrate the use of the Lord's Supper, and the participation thereof, then, according to the example of the primitive Church, our ministers do teach in their holy sermons concerning Christ, and concerning the grace which, through Him, and in Him, is given to sinners; and especially concerning His death, the shedding of His blood, and the redemption and salvation purchased thereby. After that, the whole Church doth join together in faithful prayers unto God,

to obtain this, that they may indeed use this sacrament worthily. Moreover, in the next place, absolution from sin is lawfully administered,* the words of the institution are rehearsed, and the people, by exhortation, are stirred up to a reverent consideration of this mystery, and to a cheerful and serious contemplation of the benefits of God. The sacrament is reverently, with all godliness, distributed; and the people of the faithful, most commonly falling down on their knees,† do receive this sacrament with thanksgiving, with gladness, with singing of hymns or holy songs; and they shew forth the death of the Lord, and admonish themselves of all His benefits, to the confirmation of their faith, in a true communion with Christ and His body. And all this we do according to the meaning of those things which are commanded in the holy Scripture, especially according to the saying of Christ, "Do this in remembrance of me" (*Luke* xxii., 19); and Paul saith, "So often as ye shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall shew forth the death of the Lord, till He come" (1 *Cor.* xii., 26).

V.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF FRANCE.

The Confession of France was first presented in French in the year 1559, to Francis II., king of France, at Amboise, in the behalf of all the godly of that kingdom; again, in the year 1561, at Poissy, to Charles IX.; and at length in Latin also, published by the pastors of the French churches, with a preface to all other evangelical pastors, in the year 1566.

Art. 36. We affirm that the holy Supper of the Lord, to wit, the other sacrament, is a witness to us of our uniting with our Lord Jesus Christ; because that He is not only once dead, and raised up again from the dead for us, but also He doth indeed feed

* See the Eighth Section, upon the Confession of Bohemia, Augsburg, and Saxony.

† In this rite, also, we suppose that every Church ought to have her liberty; not that we do utterly in itself condemn this manner, so that the caution be added, whereof we spake of late in the fourth observation; but because that, for the rooting of the superstitious worshipping of the bread out of men's minds, it were more expedient that that ceremony in most places were abolished in the receiving of the signs themselves; whereof look before in the first observation upon the Former Confession of Helvetia.

us and nourish us with His flesh and blood, that we, being made one with Him, may have our life common with Him. For although He be now in heaven, and shall remain there till He come to judge the world; yet we believe that, by the secret and incomprehensible virtue of His Spirit, He doth nourish and quicken us with the substance of His body and blood,* apprehended by faith. But we say that this is done spiritually, not that we may counterfeit an imagination or thought instead of the efficacy and truth; but rather, because this mystery of our union with Christ is so high a thing, that it surmounteth all our senses, yea, and the whole order of nature: to conclude, because that it, being divine and heavenly, cannot be perceived nor apprehended, but by faith.

Art. 37. We believe, as was said before, that as well in the Supper as in baptism, God doth indeed, that is, truly and effectually, give whatsoever He doth there sacramentally represent: and accordingly, with the signs, we join the true possession and fruition of that thing, which is there offered unto us. Therefore we affirm, that they which do bring pure faith, as it were a certain vessel, unto the holy Supper of the Lord, do indeed receive that which there the signs do witness; namely, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are no less the meat and drink of the soul, than bread and wine are the meat of the body.

Also, out of Article 38. *A little after the beginning:*

And, also, that that bread and wine, which is given us in the Supper, is indeed made unto us spiritual nourishment; inasmuch as they do offer unto our eyes to behold, that the flesh of Christ

* The French churches have witnessed, in general synods, that they, after the example of the ancient Fathers, do use the word *substance;* not as if the very substance of Christ were infused into the bread, or conveyed into us any manner of way, either corporal or unspeakable; or that it were applied to our corporal substance (seeing that it verily is now in heaven, and nowhere else, unto the last day, and we in earth and nowhere else); but to meet the slander of those men which think that we, instead of the very body and blood of Christ, do place only His merits, or His spiritual force and operation; whereas notwithstanding we do teach, that we (though spiritually and

is our meat, and that His blood is our drink. Therefore, we reject all those fantastical folk, which do refuse these signs and tokens, seeing that Christ our Lord hath said, "This is my body," and "This cup is my blood."

VI.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF ENGLAND.

The Confession of England was inserted in the general apology written in the year 1562, by John Jewell, bishop of Sarum, in the behalf of the English churches.

Art. 12. *Near the beginning.* We say that the Eucharist (that is to say, the Supper of the Lord) is a sacrament; that is, an evident representation of the body and blood of Christ; wherein is set, as it were, before our eyes, the death of Christ, and His resurrection, and whatsoever He did, whilst He was in His mortal body: to the end we may give Him thanks for His death, and for our deliverance, and that, by the often receiving of this sacrament, we may daily renew the remembrance thereof; and to the intent that we, being fed with the body and blood of Christ, may be brought into the hope of the resurrection and of everlasting life, and may most assuredly believe that, as our bodies be fed with bread and wine, so our souls be fed with the body and blood of Christ. To this banquet we think the people of God ought to be earnestly bidden, that they may all communicate among themselves, and openly declare and testify both the godly society which is among them, and also the hope which they have in Christ Jesus. *Chrysost. ad Ephes. Serm.* 3, *cap.* 1. For this cause, if there had been any which would be but a looker-on, and abstain from the holy communion, him did the old Fathers, and bishops of Rome in the primitive Church, before private mass came up, excommunicate, as a wicked person and as a pagan. Neither

mystically, yet, notwithstanding, truly) do participate Christ Himself, not so that either we do cleave essentially unto Him, or He unto us, but that His life is derived into us. Look, also, concerning this matter, in the first observation upon the Confession of Augsburg, in this section.

was there any Christian at that time which did communicate alone, whiles other looked on. For so did Calixtus, in times past, decree, "That after the consecration was finished, all should communicate, except they had rather stand without the church doors. For thus (saith he) did the apostles appoint, and the same the holy Church of Rome keepeth still," *De Consecr. Dist.* 1. *Cap. Omnes. Dist.* 2. *Cap. Seculares. Dist.* 2. *Cap. Peracta.* Moreover, when the people cometh to the holy communion, the sacraments ought to be given them in both kinds; for so both Christ hath commanded, and the apostles in every place have ordained, and all the ancient Fathers and Catholic bishops have followed the same. And whoso doth contrary to this, he (as Gelasius saith, *De Consecr. Dist.* 2. *Cap. Comperimus.*) committeth sacrilege. And, therefore, we say that our adversaries, at this day, who, having violently thrust out and quite forbidden the holy communion, do, without the word of God, without the authority of any ancient council, without any Catholic father, without any example of the primitive Church, yea, and without reason, also, defend and maintain their private masses, and the mangling of the sacraments; and do this, not only against the express commandment of Christ, but also against all antiquity; do wickedly therein, and are very church robbers.

We affirm, that the bread and wine are the holy and heavenly mysteries of the body and blood of Christ; and that by them Christ Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us, as that, by faith, we verily receive His body and blood. Yet say we not this so, as though we thought that the nature and substance of the bread and wine is clearly changed, and goeth to nothing; as many have dreamed in these latter times, and yet could never agree among themselves upon their own dreams. For that was not Christ's meaning, that the wheaten bread should lay apart its own nature, and receive a certain new divinity; but that it might rather change us, and (to use Theophylact's words, *in Joan. cap.* vi.), might transform us into His body. For what can be said more plainly, than that which

Ambrose saith (*De Sacram. lib.* iv. *cap.* 4): "The bread and wine remain still the same they were before, and yet are changed into another thing?" Or that which Gelasius saith (*in Dialogis* 1 *et* 2): "The substance of the bread, and the nature of the wine, ceaseth not to be?" Or that which Theodoret saith (*in Sermone ad Infantes*): "After the consecration, the mystical signs do not cast off their own proper nature: for they remain still in their former substance, form, or kind?" Or that which Augustine saith (*De Consecr. Dist.* 2. *Cap. Qui manducasti*): "That which ye see, is the bread, and cup, and so our eyes do tell us: but that which your faith requireth to be taught, is this; The bread is the body of Christ, and the cup is His blood?" Or that which Origen saith (*in Matt.* xv., 17): "The bread which is sanctified by the word of God, as touching the material substance thereof, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught?" Or that which Christ Himself said, not only after the blessing of the cup, but also after He had ministered the communion: "I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine?" (Luke xxii., 18). It is well known that the fruit of the vine is wine, and not blood. And in speaking thus, we mean not to abase the Lord's Supper, or to teach that it is but a cold ceremony only, and nothing to be wrought therein, as many falsely slander us, that we teach. For we affirm, that Christ doth truly and presently give Himself wholly in His sacraments: in baptism, that we may put Him on; and in His Supper, that we may eat Him by faith, and the Spirit, and may have everlasting life by His cross and blood. And we say not this is done slightly or coldly, but effectually and truly. For although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast, and eat Him by faith, by understanding, and by the Spirit. And it is no vain faith, that comprehendeth Christ; neither is that received with cold devotion, which is received with understanding, faith, and the Spirit. For Christ Himself altogether is so offered and given to us in these mysteries, that we may certainly know that "we be flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones" (*Ephes.*

v., 30); and that "Christ continueth in us, and we in Him" (1 *John* ii., 24).

And, therefore, in celebrating these mysteries, the people are to good purpose exhorted, before they come to receive the holy communion, to lift up their hearts, and to direct their minds to heavenwards: because He is there, by whom we must be fed, and live. Cyril saith, "When we come to receive these mysteries, all gross imaginations must quite be banished (*De Consecr. Dist.* 1. *Cap. Quando*). The Council of Nice, as it is alleged by some in Greek, plainly forbiddeth us to be basely affectioned toward the bread and wine, which are set before us. And, as Chrysostom very aptly writeth, we say, "That the body of Christ is the dead carcase, and we ourselves must be the eagles" (meaning thereby, that we must fly on high, if we will come to the body of Christ): "for this table is a table of eagles, and not of jays." Cyprian also: "This bread," saith he, "is the food of the soul, and not the meat of the belly" (*De Cœna Domini*). And St. Augustine saith, "How shall I hold Him, being absent? How shall I reach my hand up to heaven, to lay hold upon Him, sitting there?" He answereth, "Reach thither thy faith, and then thou hast laid hold upon Him" (*In Joan. Tract.* 50).

Art. 13. Neither can we away in our Churches with these shews, and sales, and markets of masses, nor with the carrying about and worshipping of the bread, nor with such other idolatrous and blasphemous fondness; which none of them can prove that Christ or His apostles ever ordained or left unto us. And we justly blame the bishops of Rome, who, without the word of God, without the authority of the holy Fathers, without any example of antiquity, after a new guise, do not only set before the people the sacramental bread to be worshipped as God, but do also carry the same about upon an ambling palfrey, whithersoever themselves journey, in such sort as, in old times, the Persian fire, and the relics of the goddess Isis, were solemnly carried about in procession; and have brought the sacraments of Christ to be used now as a stage-play, and a solemn sight; to the end that men's eyes

should be fed with nothing else but with mad gazings, and foolish gaudies, in the self-same matter, wherein the death of Christ ought diligently to be beaten into our hearts, and wherein also the mysteries of our redemption ought, with all holiness and reverence, to be performed. Besides, where they say, and sometime do persuade fools, that they are able, by their masses, to distribute and apply unto men's commodity all the merits of Christ's death (yea, although many times the parties think nothing of the matter, and understand full little what is done), this is a mockery, a heathenish fancy, and a very toy. For it is our faith that applieth the death and cross of Christ to our benefit, and not the act of the massing priest. "Faith had in the sacraments (saith Augustine, *Ad Rom. cap.* 3. *Lib.* 3) doth justify, and not the sacraments." And Origen saith, "Christ is the priest, the propitiation, and sacrifice: which propitiation cometh to every one by mean of faith." And so, by this reckoning, we say, that the sacraments of Christ, without faith, do not once profit those that be alive: a great deal less do they profit those that be dead.

VII.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF SCOTLAND.

Article 21; *towards the middle. Of the Sacraments.*

The Confession of Scotland was first exhibited to, and allowed by, the three estates in parliament, at Edinburgh, in the year 1560; again ratified at the same place, and on the same authority, in 1567; and finally subscribed by the king's majesty, and his household, at Holyrood House, the 28th day of January, 1581.

Not that we imagine any transubstantiation of bread into Christ's natural body, and of wine into His natural blood, as the Papists have perniciously taught, and damnably believed: but this union and conjunction, which we have with the body and blood of Christ Jesus in the right use of the sacrament, is wrought by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who, by true faith, carrieth us above all things that are visible, carnal, and earthly, and maketh us to feed upon the body and blood of Christ Jesus, which was once broken and shed for us, which now is in heaven,

and appearing in the presence of His Father for us. And notwithstanding the far distance of place, which is betwixt His body, now glorified in heaven, and us, now mortal on this earth; yet we must assuredly believe, that the bread which we break is the communion of Christ's body, and the cup which we bless is the communion of His blood (1 *Cor.* x., 16). So that we confess, and undoubtedly believe, that the faithful, in the right use of the Lord's table, do so eat the body and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus, that He remaineth in them, and they in Him. Yea, they are so made flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bones (*Eph.* v., 30), that, as the eternal Godhead giveth to the flesh of Christ Jesus (which of its own condition and nature, was mortal and corruptible) life and immortality; so doth Christ Jesus His flesh and blood, eaten and drunken by us, give unto us the same prerogatives. Which, albeit we confess are neither given unto us at this time only, neither yet by the proper power and virtue of the sacrament only; yet we affirm that the faithful, in the right use of the Lord's table, have such conjunction with Christ Jesus, as the natural man cannot apprehend: yea, and further we affirm, that albeit the faithful, oppressed by negligence and manly infirmity, do not profit so much as they would, in the very instant action of the Supper; yet shall it after bring fruit forth, as lively seed sown in good ground: for the Holy Spirit, which can never be divided from the right institution of the Lord Jesus, will not frustrate the faithful of the fruit of that mystical action.

VII. (2).—FROM THE CONFESSION OF WESTMINSTER DIVINES.

Chapter 29. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

1. Our Lord Jesus, in the night wherein He was betrayed, instituted the sacrament of His body and blood, called the Lord's Supper, to be observed in His Church unto the end of the world, for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of Himself in His death, the sealing all benefits thereof unto true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in Him, their further engage-

ment in and to all duties which they owe unto Him; and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with Him, and with each other, as members of His mystical body.

2. In this sacrament, Christ is not offered up to His Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all for remission of sin of the quick or dead; but only a commemoration of that one offering up of Himself, by Himself, upon the cross, once for all; and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same. So that the Popish sacrifice of the mass, as they call it, is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sins of the elect.

3. The Lord Jesus hath, in this ordinance, appointed His ministers to declare His word of institution to the people; to pray, and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to an holy use; and to take and break the bread, to take the cup, and (they communicating also themselves) to give both to the communicants; but to none who are not then present in the congregation.

4. Private masses, or receiving this sacrament by a priest, or any other alone; as likewise the denial of the cup to the people, worshipping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving them for any pretended religious use, are all contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ.

5. The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to Him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent; to wit, the body and blood of Christ; albeit in substance and nature they still remain truly and only bread and wine, as they were before.

6. That doctrine which maintains a change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood (commonly called transubstantiation), by consecration of a priest, or by any other way, is repugnant, not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason; overthroweth the nature of

the sacrament, and hath been, and is, the cause of manifold superstitions; yea, of gross idolatries.

7. Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly, by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of His death: the body and blood of Christ being then, not corporally or carnally, in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses.

8. Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby; but by their unworthy coming thereunto, are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, to their own damnation. Wherefore all ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with Him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table; and cannot without great sin against Christ, while they remain such, partake of these holy mysteries, or be admitted thereunto.

VIII.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF BELGIA.

The Confession of Belgia was published in French, in the name of all the churches of Belgia, in the year 1566; and, in the year 1579, in the public synod of Belgium, was repeated, confirmed, and turned into the Belgian tongue.

Art. 35. We believe and confess, that Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, hath instituted the holy sacrament of His Supper, that in it He might nourish and sustain those whom He hath regenerated and engrafted into His family, which is the Church. But those which are regenerate, have in them a double life: the one carnal and temporal, which they brought with them from their first nativity, the which is common unto all; the other spiritual and heavenly, bestowed upon them in their second nativity, which is wrought in them by the word of the Gospel, in the union of the body of Christ, the which is peculiar to the elect alone. And as God hath appointed earthly and material bread,

fit and convenient for the preservation of this carnal life, which, even as the life itself, is common unto all; so, for the conserva tion of that spiritual and heavenly life, which is proper to the faithful, God hath sent lively bread, which came down from heaven, even Jesus Christ, who nourisheth and sustaineth the spiritual life of the faithful, if He be eaten (that is, applied and received) by faith, through the Spirit. But to the intent that Christ might figurate and represent unto us this spiritual and heavenly bread, He hath ordained visible and earthly bread and wine for the sacrament of His body and blood; whereby He testifieth, that as truly as we do receive and hold in our hands this sign, eating the same with our mouths, whereby afterwards this our life is sustained, so truly we do by faith (which is to our soul instead of hand and mouth) receive the very body and true blood of Christ, our only Saviour, in ourselves, unto the conservation and cherishing of a spiritual life within us. And it is most certain that Christ, not without good cause, doth so carefully commend unto us this His sacrament, as one that doth indeed work that within us, whatsoever He representeth unto us by these His holy signs; although the manner itself, being far above the reach of our capacity, cannot be comprehended of any; because that all the operations of the Holy Ghost are hidden and incomprehensible.* Neither shall we err in saying, that that which is eaten† is the very natural body of Christ, and that that which is drunk is the very blood of Christ. Yet the instrument, or means, whereby we do eat and drink them, is not a corporal mouth, but even our soul and spirit, and that by faith. Christ, therefore, sitteth always at the right hand of His Father in heaven: and yet, for all that, doth not anything the less communicate Himself unto us by faith.

* That is to say, both when the proper force of the Holy Spirit, which is incomprehensible, is regarded, and seeing that His effects do exceed our senses; both which do come to pass in these mysteries.

† Namely, by faith, as it is often iterated in this confession; that is to say, *that* is received spiritually, by the mind, in believing, as the sign is eaten and drunken corporally. For the words *eating* and *drinking* can not otherwise be spoken of the mind, and of faith (which are the only instruments of receiving the very body and blood of Christ), than metaphorically or metonymically.

Furthermore, this Supper is the spiritual table, whereat Christ doth offer Himself to us, with all His benefits, to be participated of us; and bringeth to pass, that in it we are partakers, as well of Himself, as of the merit of His death and passion. For He Himself, by the eating of His flesh, doth nourish, strengthen, and comfort our miserable, afflicted, and comfortless soul, and, in like manner, by the drinking of His blood, doth refresh and sustain the same.* Moreover, although the signs be coupled with the things signified,† yet both of them are not received of all. For an evil man verily receiveth the sacrament unto his own condemnation; but the thing or truth of the sacrament he receiveth not. As, for example, Judas, and Simon Magus, did both of them receive the sacramental sign; but as for Christ Himself signified thereby, they received Him not. For Christ is communicated to the faithful only. Last of all, we, with great humility and reverence, do communicate the holy sacrament in the assembly of God's people, celebrating the memorial of our Saviour Christ's death with thanksgiving, and making there a public confession of Christian faith and religion. No man, therefore, ought to present himself at this holy Supper, which hath not first examined himself; lest that, eating of this bread, and drinking of this cup, he do eat and drink his own damnation. Moreover, by the use of this sacrament, a most ardent love is kindled within us, both towards God Himself, and also towards our neighbour. Therefore here we do worthily reject, as a mere profanation, all the toys and damnable devices of men, which they have presumed to add and mingle with the sacraments; affirming, that all the godly are content with that only order and rite, which Christ and His apostles have delivered unto us, and that they ought to speak of these mysteries after the same manner as the apostles have spoken before.

* That is (as hath been said in the former observation), by a spiritual participation; the which, sometimes by reason of the sacramental receiving, and sometimes by reason of that spiritual life which Christ engendereth in us, is metaphorically signified by the names of eating or drinking.

† Of the sacramental union we have spoken before, in the second observation upon the Confession of Bohemia.

IX.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG.

The Tenth Article, out of the edition of Wirtemburg, Anno 1531.

The Confession of Augsburg was first presented in the German tongue at the city of Augsburg, in the year 1530, to the Emperor Charles the Fifth, by certain most renowned princes of Germany, and by other states of the sacred empire, whom they call Protestants. Secondly, the self-same year, it was set forth and published in Latin, at Wirtemburg, somewhat corrected in certain articles, with a preface, and the subscription of the authors' names.

Touching the Supper of the Lord, they teach, that the body and blood of Christ are there present indeed,* and are distributed

* We, also, do allow of this, namely, that the word of God is not deceitful; and therefore, as often as the holy signs are rightly given, that is, according to Christ His institution, that then, also, the thing signified by the sign (which is the very body of Christ crucified for us, and the very blood of Christ shed for us) is also given to be received. But we affirm, that the thing signified is not otherwise coupled with the sign, than sacramentally. The truth of which sacramental conjunction doth not consist in this, that, wheresoever the sign is, there the thing represented by the sign should also be present; but in this, that that which God promiseth by the sign, He also doth offer to be received. Therefore we hold that the body of Christ is not really present in, with, or under the bread, otherwise than after this sacramental manner: both because it is a true body, being circumscribed in its local situation, and also hath truly ascended from the earth, above all the heavens that be subject to our sight, and shall there remain (from whence He exerciseth a government over all things beneath, even as He is man) until He come truly from thence to judge both quick and dead. Moreover we do also avouch, that, as the signs are offered to the body, so the things signified are offered to the mind. And therefore that the signs are received of every one with the hand and mouth, that come unto the Supper (the which unto some, namely, the worthy receivers, do turn unto salvation, but unto others, that is, the unworthy communicants, by reason of the profanation of the signs, and contempt of the thing signified, they do turn to condemnation); but as for the things signified, those we affirm to be truly and effectually apprehended only of those that be endued with a right mind and a true faith, and that always unto salvation, whereunto the distance of place is no hindrance, by reason of the unspeakable operation of the Holy Ghost. And yet not so, as that the substances should be mingled betwixt themselves, or cleave together in any place (for Christ's flesh abideth in heaven and ours upon the earth); but so that (those things being mystically united, which in true distance of situation are separated) we might draw from the flesh of Christ all gifts necessary for our salvation, and especially that lively juice whereby we are nourished to eternal life. Therefore, whatsoever they pretend which are of the contrary judgment, the controversy is not of the signs, or of the things signified, or of the truth of the sacraments, or of the actual receiving of them, or of the effects: but only of the definition of the sacramental conjunction, and also of the manner of receiving the things signified: both which we contend to be so interpreted by some out of the word of God, that, if their opinion be once granted, both the truth of Christ's body, and His ascension into heaven and second coming is, consequently, overthrown. See the exposition of this article, expressed in the divers editions of the Augsburg Confession,

to those that eat of the Lord's Supper; and they condemn those that teach otherwise.

The same Tenth Article, in the edition newly corrected, Anno 1540, *is thus set down:*

Touching the Supper of the Lord, they teach, that, together with the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are truly exhibited to them that eat of the Lord's Supper.

Hitherto, also, pertaineth the First Article; of Abuses which are changed in the outward rites and ceremonies. This Article is, Of the Mass:

Our churches are wrongfully accused to have abolished the mass. For the mass is retained still among us,* and celebrated with great reverence: yea, and almost all the ceremonies that have been in use; saving that, with the songs in Latin, we mingle certain psalms in Dutch here and there, which be added for the people's instruction. For, therefore, we have need of ceremonies, that they may teach the unlearned; and that the preaching of God's word may stir up some unto the true fear, trust, and invo-

though not after the same manner, nor in the same words: and for the full declaration thereof, look into the admonition lately set forth by our brethren the Neustadtians, in the fifth chapter; out of the which our agreement in this point of doctrine, rightly declared, doth appear.

* The princes and divines in the assembly at Neuburg testified, in the year 1561, as is manifest by the decrees of that assembly, that they by the word *mass* do understand the administration of the Supper, and do from the bottom of their hearts detest the Romish mass. But although we do abhor all contentions about words, and do acknowledge that the word *mass* is not newly sprung up in the Latin Church; yet, seeing that the original of this term (namely, because alms were sent from the faithful in their usual meetings at their love-feasts) is long since abolished; and seeing that this word hath these many years broken out into great abomination, so great, indeed, that none so gross or execrable was ever heard of; we do not without cause, together with the thing, abolish the name itself out of our churches. As for the holy liturgy, we think that it is there most rightly celebrated, where it is most simply, and most nearly unto the first institution, observed. And seeing it is manifest that the ceremonies in the Roman liturgy are partly in themselves unprofitable, partly tending rather to an ambitious shew and pomp than to edification, partly ridiculous, and partly either in themselves superstitious, or else ready to be turned into superstition; therefore the most of them, or in a manner all, we have in every place utterly swept away: yet so as that the Church hath her liberty left in things indifferent, as it is meet, and shall be declared in the seventeenth section. As for the speaking or singing of anything in the public liturgy, in such a tongue as is unknown to the common people, unless there be an interpreter, the apostle doth plainly forbid it (1 Cor. xiv., 27, 28).

cation of God. And this is not only commanded by St. Paul, to use a tongue that the people understand, but man's law hath also appointed it. We use the people to receive the sacrament together, if so be any be found fit thereunto. And that is a thing that doth increase the reverence and due estimation of the public ceremonies. For none are admitted, except they be first proved and tried. Besides, we use to put men in mind of the worthiness and use of a sacrament, what great comfort it offereth unto them which repent; to the end that men may learn to fear God, and believe in Him, and to use prayer and supplication unto Him, looking for all good things at His hands. This is the true worship of Christians: these services, of fear, faith, prayer, hope, &c., God doth like. When, therefore, these services are performed, in the use of ceremonies, then doth the using of the sacraments please God. So that, when as the people are accustomed to the ceremony, and advertised of the true use thereof, the masses are said with us after a meet and godly manner. And thus all things are ordered in the Church with greater gravity and reverence, than in times past.

It is not unknown that, these many ages past, there hath been common and open complaint made by good men, of the abuse and profanation of masses. For it is easy to be seen how far this abuse hath spread itself in all our churches; what kind of men they are that say the masses, flat contrary to the prescript of the canons; also how shamefully they are turned to a matter of cursed lucre. For many there be that say masses, without repentance, only for the belly's sake. These things are too open and manifest to be kept any longer in hugger-mugger.* Surely it seemeth that never any religious thing, since the world began, was so commonly turned into gain, as the mass. But St. Paul doth fearfully threaten them, which deal otherwise with these sacraments, than is beseeming the dignity of them; where he saith, "He that eateth this bread and drinketh this cup unworthily, is guilty of the body and

* In *hugger-mugger*—that is, in holes and corners, under cover.—Editor.

blood of the Lord" (1 *Cor.* xi., 27). And, in the Ten Commandments, it is written, "He that abuseth God's holy name, shall not escape unpunished" (*Exod.* xx., 7). As, therefore, the world hath oft, heretofore, been justly punished for idolatry, so, doubtless, this shameless profaning of masses will be fearfully revenged with grievous penalties. And it may well be that the Church, in these latter times, is punished with blindness, discord, and wars, and many other plagues, chiefly for this one cause. And yet these open and gross abuses have the bishops (who cannot be ignorant of them) not only borne withal, but also smoothly laughed at them. And now, all too late, they begin to complain, forsooth, of the calamity of the Church; when, as no other thing hath been the occasion of the broils of these times, but the abuses themselves, which were now become too open and evident, that modest men could no longer bear them. Would to God that the bishops had (as by their office they might have), long before this, bridled and restrained the covetousness, or impudence, whether of monks, or of some others, who, changing the manner of the old Church, have made the mass a money matter.

But it will not be amiss now to shew, whence these abuses did spring at the first. There is an opinion spread abroad in the Church, that the Supper of the Lord is a work, which, being once done by the priest, deserveth remission of sins, both of the fault and of the punishment, not only for him that doth it, but also for theirs: and that because of the work done, although it be done without any good intent of the doer. Likewise, that if it be applied in the behalf of the dead, it is satisfactory—that is, it deserveth remission of the pains of purgatory. And in this meaning they take the word *sacrifice*, when they call the mass a sacrifice; namely, a work that, being done in the behalf of some others, doth merit for them remission both of the fault and of the punishments; and that because of the very work done, even without any good intent of him that useth it. Thus they mean, that the priest in the mass doth offer a sacrifice for the quick and the dead. And after this persuasion was once received, they taught

men to seek forgiveness of sins, and all good things, yea, and to free the dead from punishments, by the benefit of the mass. And it made no matter what kind of men they were that said the masses; for they taught that they were very available for others, without any good motion of the user. Afterward a question arose, whether one mass said for many was as available as several masses for several persons. And this disputation did augment the number of masses, and the gain that came in by them, out of measure. But we dispute not now of the gain; we only accuse the impiety of them. For our divines do prove plainly, that this opinion of the meriting and applying of the mass, is both false and impious. This is the state of this controversy between us and them.

And it is no hard matter for the godly to judge of this point, if a man will but weigh the arguments that follow. First, we have proved before, that men do obtain remission of sins freely by faith; that is, by sure trust to obtain mercy for Christ's sake. It is then impossible for a man to obtain remission of sins for another man's work, and that without any good motion; that is, without his own faith. This reason doth very evidently overthrow that monstrous and impious opinion, touching the merit and application of the mass.

Secondly, Christ's passion was an oblation and satisfaction, not only for original sin, but also for all other sins; as it is written in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "We are sanctified by the oblation of Christ once offered" (*Heb.* x., 10); and again: "By one oblation He hath made perfect for ever those that are sanctified" (*ver.* 14). To conclude: a good part of the Epistle to the Hebrews is spent in confirming this point, that the only sacrifice of Christ hath merited remission of sins, or reconciliation, for others. Therefore he saith that the Levitical sacrifices were oftimes offered, because they could not take away sins; but that Christ, by His sacrifice, hath at once satisfied for the sins of all men (*Heb.* x., 11, 12). This honour of Christ's sacrifice must not be transferred from Him to the work of a priest. For He saith expressly, that "by one oblation the saints are made per-

fect" (*ver.* 10). Besides, it is a wicked thing to place that trust in the work of a priest, which should only lean and stay itself upon the oblation and intercession of Christ the High Priest.

Thirdly, Christ, in the institution of the Lord's Supper, doth not command the priests to offer for others, either quick or dead. Upon what ground, then, or authority, was this worship ordained in the Church, as an offering for sins, without any commandment of God? But that is yet more gross, and far from all reason, that the mass should be applied to deliver the souls of such as are dead. For the mass was ordained for a remembrance; that is, that such as received the Supper of the Lord, should stir up and confirm their faith, and comfort their distressed consciences, with the remembrance of Christ's benefits. Neither is the mass a satisfaction for punishment; but it was instituted because of the remission of the fault; to wit, not that it should be a satisfaction for the fault, but that it might be a sacrament, by the use whereof we might be put in mind of the benefit of Christ, and the forgiveness of the fault. Seeing, therefore, that the applying of the Supper of the Lord for the deliverance of the dead has been received without warrant of Scripture, yea, quite contrary to Scripture, it is to be condemned, as a new and ungodly worship or service.

Fourthly, a ceremony, in the new covenant, without faith, meriteth nothing,* neither for him that useth it, nor for others. For it is a dead work, according to the saying of Christ, "The true worshippers, shall worship the Father in spirit and truth" (*John* iv., 23). The same doth the eleventh chapter to the Hebrews prove throughout: "By faith, Abel offered a better offering unto God" (*ver.* 4): also, "Without faith, it is impossible to please God" (*ver.* 6). Therefore the mass doth not merit remission of

* No, nor yet in the Old Testament: yea, neither any ceremony, nor faith itself, doth merit anything; but whereas the external work, being performed with faith, according to God's commandment, is acceptable unto Him, all this we teach out of God's word to be of grace, and not of debt. Whereof look to the eighth section and seventh observation, and to the ninth section and second observation, upon the same Confession of Augsburg.

the fault, or of the punishment, for the work's sake performed. This reason doth evidently overthrow the merit, as they call it, which ariseth of the work that is done.

Fifthly, the applying of the benefit of Christ is by a man's own faith; as Paul witnesseth, "Whom God hath set forth to be a reconciliation, through faith in His blood" (*Rom.* iii., 25). And this applying is made freely. And, therefore, it is not made by another man's work, nor for another man's work. For when we use the sacrament, this application is made by our own work, and by our own faith, and not by another man's work For surely if we could have no remission but by applying of masses, it should be very uncertain, and our faith and trust should be transferred from Christ unto the work of a priest: and so is it come to pass, as all men see. Moreover, faith placed in the work of a man is wholly condemned. Arguments, with sundry other, do witness for us, that the opinion of the merit and applying of the mass for the quick and the dead, was, for good causes, misliked and reproved.

Now, if we would stand to consider how far this error is spread in the Church, how the number of masses hath increased, and how, through this sacrifice, forgiveness both of the fault and of the punishment is promised to the quick and the dead, it will appear that the Church is disfigured with shameful blots by this profanation. There never fell out a weightier cause in the Church, O noble emperor, or more worthy for good and learned men, to debate of. It is the duty of all the godly, with most fervent prayers, to crave at God's hand, that the Church might be delivered from these foul enormities. All kings and bishops must, with all their might, endeavour that this whole matter may be rightly laid forth, and the Church purged.

Sixthly, the institution of the sacrament is contrary to that abuse. For there is not a word set down of any oblation for the sins of the quick and the dead; but a commandment to receive the body and blood of Christ, and to do it in remembrance of the benefit of Christ. This remembrance doth signify, not a bare

representing of the history, as it were in a shew (as they dream that are the patrons of merit, by reason of the work wrought); but it signifieth by faith to remember the promise and benefit, to comfort the conscience, and to render thanks for so great a blessing. For the principal cause of the institution was, that our faith might then be stirred up and exercised, when we do receive this pledge of God's grace. Besides, the institution ordaineth, that there should be a communication; that is, that the ministers of the Church should give unto others the body and blood of the Lord. And that this order was observed in the primitive Church, St. Paul is witness to the Corinthians, when as he commandeth, "that one should stay for another" (1 *Cor.* xi., 33), that there might be a common partaking of the sacrament.

Now that the abuses of the private mass be discovered (forasmuch as they all, for the most part, were used by way of application for the sins of other men, and do not agree with the institution of Christ), therefore they are left off in our churches. And there is one common mass appointed, according to the institution of Christ, wherein the pastors of the churches do consecrate for themselves,* and give unto others, the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. And this kind of mass is used every holy-day,† and other days also, if any be desirous to use the sacrament. Yet none are admitted to the communion, except they be first tried and examined. We adjoin, moreover, godly sermons, according as Christ commanded, that there should be sermons when this ceremony is used. And in such sermons, as men are taught diligently in other articles and precepts of the Gospel, so are they also put in mind for what use the sacrament was instituted; to wit, not that these ceremonies should merit for them remission of sins by the bare work done, but that the sacrament

* By the name of consecration we understand no other thing, than the use of Christ's ordination, by whose blessing and power the elements are sanctified unto us; whereof dependeth the whole force and dignity of the sacraments.

† Of holy-days is spoken afterwards in the sixteenth section. But in our churches certain days by public warning are appointed, wherein if any refuse to receive the Supper, they answer for it in the Consistory.

should be a testimony and a pledge, whereby Christ doth testify that He performeth the things promised to us,* and that His promises pertain unto us; that Christ giveth us His body, to testify that He is effectual in us, as in His members; and His blood, to testify unto us that we are washed with His blood. The sacrament, therefore, doth profit them that do repent, and seek comfort therein; and being confirmed by that testimony, do believe that remission of sins is given them indeed, and are thankful unto Christ for so great a benefit. And so the application of the benefit of Christ is not by another man's work, but by every man's own faith, and his own use of the sacrament. For when we, in our own persons, use the sacrament, Christ's institution of it doth belong unto us.

This kind of use of the sacrament is holy, and to be taught in the churches, as that which doth give light unto the doctrine of faith, and of spiritual exercises, and of true worship, and bringeth unto the consciences of the godly very great comfort and strength of faith. Before these days, the Church hath been far otherwise taught. Touching the use of the sacrament, there was no word of anything, but that this work was to be done; but no man spake anything of faith, or the comfort of consciences. And men's consciences were racked with over-great care and pains of confessing themselves. This they took to be the purity which the Gospel requireth; whereas the Gospel doth require true fear, true faith and trust, and comforteth us by the use of this sacrament, that they which do truly repent, may assuredly believe that God is become merciful unto them by Christ, though that our nature be frail and unclean, and though that this our imperfect obedience be far from the perfection of the law.

By all this that hath been said, it is clear that the mass that is in use amongst us, doth agree with the institution of Christ, and

* As an instance of the sad inaccuracy with which books were edited and printed two centuries ago, it may be noticed that, in both editions of the English Harmony, the whole of the clause above, from the beginning of the sentence, is given *twice over* in almost the very same words.—EDITOR.

the manner of the primitive Church. And, besides, it doth notably lay open the true use of the sacrament. Such a common work was there in the Church of old time, as Chrysostom doth witness; who saith, "that the priest did stand at the altar, and call some unto the communion, and put back others." And, by the decrees of the Nicene Synod, it is evident that some one did celebrate the liturgy, as the Grecians call it, and did minister the body and blood of the Lord to all the rest. For these are the words of the decree: "Let the deacons in their order, after the elders, receive the holy communion of a bishop, or of an elder." Here he doth expressly say, that the priests did receive the sacrament of some one that ministered it. And, before Gregory's time, there is no mention of any private mass; but, as oft as the old writers speak of a mass, it is evident that they speak of a mass that was common. Seeing, therefore, that the rite and manner of the mass, used with us, hath authority out of Scripture, and example from the old Church, and that we have only rejected certain intolerable abuses, we hope that the use of our churches cannot be misliked. As for other indifferent rites and ceremonies, they are, for the most part, observed according to the usual manner. But the number of masses is not alike. "Neither was it the use in old times, in the churches whereunto was greatest resort, to have mass every day," as "The Tripartite History," lib. ix., cap. 38, doth witness. Again saith it, "In Alexandria, every fourth and sixth day in the week, the Scriptures are read, and the doctors do interpret them; and all other things are done also, except only the yearly manner of oblation."

This Article we find elsewhere placed in the Third Place, among those wherein the Abuses that be changed are reckoned up, in this manner:

Of the Mass.

Our churches are wrongfully accused to have abolished the mass. For the mass is retained still among us, and celebrated with great reverence; yea, and almost all the ceremonies that are in use, saving that, with the songs in Latin, we mingle certain

psalms in Dutch here and there, which be added for the people's instruction. For, therefore, we have need of ceremonies, that they may teach the unlearned, and that the preaching of God's word may stir up some unto the true fear, trust, and invocation of God. This is not only commanded by St. Paul, to use a tongue that the people understand (1 *Cor.* xiv., 9), but man's law hath also appointed it. We use the people to receive the sacrament together, if so be any be found fit thereunto. And that is a thing that doth increase the reverence and due estimation of the public ceremonies. For none are admitted, except they be first proved and tried. Besides, we use to put men in mind of the worthiness and use of a sacrament, how great comfort it bringeth to fearful consciences; that they may learn to believe God, and to look for and crave all good things at His hands. This worship doth please God: such an use of the sacrament doth nourish piety towards God. Therefore it seemeth not that masses be more religiously celebrated among our adversaries than with us.

But it is evident that, of long time, this hath been the public and most grievous complaint of all good men, that masses are filthily profaned, being used for gain. And it is not unknown how far this abuse hath spread itself in all churches; of what manner of men masses are used, only for a reward, or for wages; and how many do use them against the prohibition of the canons. And Paul doth grievously threaten those which handle the Lord's Supper unworthily, saying, "He that shall eat this bread, or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (1 *Cor.* xi., 27). Therefore, when we admonished the priests of this sin, private masses were laid aside among us, seeing that for the most part there were no private masses but only for lucre's sake. Neither were the bishops ignorant of these abuses, who, if they had amended them in time, there had now been less dissension. Heretofore, by their dissembling, they suffered much corruption to creep into the Church; now they begin, though it be late, to complain of the calamities of the Church; seeing that this hurly-burly was raised up by no other

mean than by those abuses, which were so evident, that they could no longer be tolerated. There were many dissensions, concerning the mass and the sacrament. And, peradventure, the world is punished for so long a profaning of masses, which they, who both could and ought to have amended it, have so many years tolerated in their churches. For, in the Ten Commandments, it is written, "He that abuseth the name of the Lord, shall not escape unpunished" (*Exod.* xx., 7). And, from the beginning of the world, there neither was nor is any divine thing, which might seem so to be employed to gain, as is the mass.

There was added an opinion, which did increase private masses infinitely; to wit, that Christ, by His passion, did satisfy for original sin, and appointed mass, wherein an oblation should be made for daily sins, both mortal and venial. Hereupon a common opinion was received, that mass is a work that taketh away the sins of the quick and the dead, and that for the doing of the work. Here men began to dispute, whether one mass said for many were of as great force as particular masses said for particular men. This disputation hath brought forth an infinite multitude of masses. Concerning these opinions our preachers have admonished us, that they do disagree from the holy Scriptures, and hurt the glory of the passion of Christ. For the passion of Christ was an oblation and satisfaction, not only for original sin, but also for all other sins; as it is written in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "We are sanctified by the oblation of Jesus Christ once made;" also, "By one oblation He hath made perfect for ever those that are sanctified" (*Heb.* x., 10, 14). Also the Scripture teacheth, that we are justified before God through faith in Christ, when we believe that our sins are forgiven for Christ His sake. Now, if the mass do take away the sins of the quick and the dead, even for the work's sake that is done, then justification cometh by the work of masses, and not by faith, which the Scripture cannot away withal. But Christ commandeth us "to do it in remembrance of Himself" (*Luke* xxii., 19); therefore the mass is instituted, that faith, in them which use the sacrament, may

remember what benefits it receiveth by Christ, and that it may raise and comfort a fearful conscience. For this is to remember Christ—to wit, to remember His benefits—and to feel and perceive that they be indeed exhibited unto us. Neither is it sufficient to call to mind the history; because that the Jews, also, and the wicked, can do that. Therefore the mass must be used to this end, that there the sacrament may be reached unto them that have need of comfort; as Ambrose saith, "Because I do always sin, therefore I ought always to receive a medicine." And, seeing that the mass is such a communion of the sacrament, we do observe one common mass every holy-day, and on other days, if any will use the sacrament, when it is offered to them which desire it. Neither is this custom newly brought into the Church. For the ancient Fathers, before Gregory's time, make no mention of any private mass: of the common mass they speak much. Chrysostom saith, "that the priest did daily stand at the altar, and call some unto the communion and put back others." And, by the ancient canons, it is evident that some one did celebrate the mass, of whom other elders and deacons did receive the body of the Lord. For so the words of the Nicene canon do sound: "Let the deacons in their order, after the elders, receive the holy communion of a bishop or of an elder." And Paul, concerning the communion, commandeth, "that one tarry for another" (1 *Cor.* xi., 33), that so there may be a common participation. Seeing, therefore, that amongst us the mass hath the example of the Church, out of the Scripture, and the Fathers, we hope that it cannot be disliked; especially for that our public ceremonies are kept of us, the most part, alike unto the usual ceremonies: only the number of masses is not alike, the which, by reason of very great and manifest abuses, it were certainly far better to be moderated. "For in times past, also, in the churches whereunto was greatest resort, it was not the use to have mass said every day," as the "Tripartite History," lib. ix., cap. 38, doth witness. Again saith it, "In Alexandria, every fourth and sixth day of the week, the Scriptures are read, and the doctors do interpret them; and

all other things are done, also, except only the yearly manner of oblation.

Also, Article 2. *Of both kinds of the Sacrament.*

And, forasmuch as we do celebrate the common mass, that the people may understand that they, also, are sanctified through the blood of Christ, and learn the true use of this ceremony; either part of the sacrament in the Supper of the Lord is given to the laity; because the sacrament was instituted, not only for a part of the Church, namely, for elders, but also for the rest of the Church. And, therefore, the people doth use the sacrament, as Christ appointed it. And certainly Christ saith, "Drink all ye of this" (*Matt.* xxvi., 27), where He saith manifestly, concerning the cup, that all should drink. And that no man might cavil, that it doth only appertain to the priests, the ordinance of Paul to the Corinthians doth witness, that the whole Church did use either part in common. This custom remained a long time, even in the latter churches; neither is it certain when, or by what author, it was changed. Cyprian, in certain places, doth witness, that the blood was given to the people; for thus he writeth to Cornelius the Pope: "How do we teach or provoke them to shed their blood in the confession of His name, if we deny the blood of Christ to them which are in this warfare? or how shall we make them fit for the cup of martyrdom, if we do not first admit them, by the right of communication, to drink in the Church the cup of the Lord?" And Jerome saith, "The priests do minister the Eucharist, and divide the blood of the Lord to the people." In the decrees there is a canon of Pope Gelasius, which forbiddeth the sacrament to be divided: these be the words—"We do understand that certain men, having received the portion of the holy body only, do abstain from the cup of the holy blood; who, because that I know not by what superstition they are taught to be tied hereunto, either let them unfeignedly receive the whole sacraments, or let them be put back from the whole sacraments, because that one and the self-same mystery cannot be divided without

great sacrilege." In the "Tripartite History," it is written, in reprehension of Theodosius, the emperor (whom Ambrose would not admit to the communion without repentance, because that, at Thessalonica, he had too grievously revenged the death of a few soldiers which were slain in an uproar, and had murdered seven thousand citizens), — here saith Ambrose: "How canst thou, with these hands, receive the holy body of the Lord? with what rashness canst thou take into thy mouth the cup of that holy blood?' &c. Therefore it is evident, that it was the custom of the ancient Church to give either part of the sacrament to the people; only a new start-up custom doth take away one part from the people. Here we will not dispute what men are to think concerning a received custom, contrary to the authority of the apostolic Scripture, contrary to the canons, and contrary to the example of the primitive Church. For all godly men do understand that, touching Christian doctrine, consciences are to ask counsel at the word of the Lord, and that no custom is to be allowed which is contrary to the word of God. And although, in the Latin Church, custom hath changed the ancient manner, yet it doth not disallow or forbid it; neither, indeed, ought human authority to forbid the ordinance of Christ, and the most received custom of the ancient Church. Therefore we have not thought it good to forbid the use of the whole sacrament. And in that ceremony, which ought to be the covenant of mutual love in the Church, we would not, contrary to charity, be hard to other men's consciences, which had rather use the whole sacrament; neither did we think that any cruelty should be exercised in that matter: but so much as in us lieth, together with the ceremony, we have restored the holy doctrine touching the fruit of the ceremony, that the people may understand how the sacrament is laid before them, to comfort the consciences of them that do repent. This doctrine doth allure the godly to the use and reverence of the sacrament. For not only the ceremony was before maimed, but also the chief doctrine, touching the fruit thereof, was utterly neglected. And, peradventure, the maiming of the ceremony did signify, that the Gospel

touching the blood of Christ (that is, the benefit of Christ His death) was obscured. Now, by the benefit of God, the pure doctrine concerning faith, together with this ceremony, is renewed and restored.

This Article we find placed elsewhere in the First Place, amongst those wherein the Abuses which are changed are reckoned, after this manner:

Of Both Kinds.

Either kind of the Sacrament in the Lord's Supper is given to the laity, because that this custom hath the commandment of the Lord, "Drink all ye of this" (*Matt.* xxvi., 27), where Christ doth manifestly command concerning the cup, that all should drink. And that no man might cavil, that it doth only appertain to the priests, the example of Paul to the Corinthians doth witness, that the whole Church did use either part in common (1 *Cor.* xi., 28). This custom remained a long time, even in the latter churches; neither is it certain when, or by what author, it was changed. Cyprian, in certain places, doth witness that the blood was given to the people: the same thing doth Jerome testify, saying, "The priests do minister the sacrament, and distribute the blood of Christ to the people." Yea, Gelasius the Pope commandeth, that the sacrament be not divided. (*Dist.* 2. *De Consecr. Cap. Comperimus.*) Only a new custom, brought in of late, doth otherwise. But it is manifest that a custom, brought in contrary to the commandments of God, is not to be allowed, as the canons do witness (*Dist.* 8. *Cap. Veritate*), with that which followeth. Now this custom is received, not only against the Scripture, but also against the ancient canons and the example of the Church. Therefore, if any had rather use both parts of the sacrament, they were not to be compelled to do otherwise with the offence of their conscience. And, because that the parting of the sacrament doth not agree with the institution of Christ,* we use to omit that procession which hitherto hath been in use.

* This, verily, is one cause why the carrying about of the sacrament is condemned; yet neither the only cause nor the chiefest.

X.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF SAXONY.

Article 14. *Of the Holy Supper of the Lord.*

The Confession of Saxony was written in Latin in the year 1551, in the behalf of the Saxon churches, by Master Philip Melancthon, that it might be presented to the Council of Trent; to which not only the Saxon and Meissen churches, but also very many other, did subscribe, as if to the Confession of Augsburg repeated.

Both baptism and the Supper of the Lord are pledges and testimonies of grace, as was said before, which do admonish us of the promise, and of our whole redemption, and do shew that the benefits of the Gospel do pertain to every one of those that use these ceremonies. But yet here is the difference: by baptism every one is ingrafted into the Church; but the Lord would have the Supper of the Lord to be also the sinew of the public congregation, &c. *The rest that followeth, pertaineth to the Fifteenth Section, till you come to these words that follow:*—Even as, also, in the very words of the Supper, there is a promise included; seeing He commandeth that the death of the Lord should be shewed forth, and this Supper distributed, till He come (1 *Cor.* xi., 26).

That, therefore, we may use this sacrament with the greater reverence, let the true causes of the institution thereof be well weighed, which pertain to the public congregation, and to the comfort of every one. The first cause is this: The Son of God will have the voice of His Gospel to sound in a public congregation, and such an one as is of good behaviour. The bond of this congregation He will have this receiving to be, which is to be done with great reverence, seeing that there a testimony is given of the wonderful conjunction betwixt the Lord and the receivers; of which reverence Paul speaketh, saying, "He that receiveth unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (1 *Cor.* xi., 27). Secondly, he will have both the sermon and the ceremony itself, to be profitable, both for the preservation, and also for the propagation of the memory of His passion, resurrection, and benefits. Thirdly, He will have every receiver to be singularly confirmed by this testimony, that he may assure him-

self that the benefits of the Gospel do pertain to him, seeing that the sermon is common; and by this testimony, and by this receiving, He sheweth that thou art a member of His, and that thou art washed in His blood, and that He doth make this covenant with thee, "Abide in me, and I in you" (*John* xv., 4): also, "I in them, and they in me" (*John* xvii., 23). Fourthly, He will have this public receiving to be a confession, whereby thou mayest shew what kind of doctrine thou dost embrace, and to what company thou dost join thyself. Also, He will have us to give thanks, publicly and privately, in this very ceremony, to God the Eternal Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, both for other benefits, and, namely, for this infinite benefit of our redemption and salvation. Also, He will that the members of the Church should have a bond of mutual love among themselves. Thus we see that many ends do meet together. By the remembrance of these weighty causes, men are invited to the reverence and use of the sacrament; and we teach how the use may be profitable. We do plainly condemn that monstrous error of the monks, who have written, that the receiving doth deserve remission of sins, and that for the work's sake, without any good motion of him that useth it. This pharisaical imagination is contrary to that saying, "The just shall live by His faith" (*Hab.* ii., 4). Therefore, we do thus instruct the Church, that they which will approach to the Supper of the Lord, must bring repentance or conversion with them; and, having their faith now kindled, must here seek the confirmation of this faith, in the consideration of the death, and resurrection, and benefits of the Son of God; because that, in the use of this sacrament, there is a witness borne, which declareth that the benefits of the Son of God do pertain to thee also; and there is a witness that He joineth thee as a member to Himself, and that He is in thee;* as He said, "I in them," &c. (*John* xvii., 23). Therefore we give

* This we admit, touching the spiritual efficacy, not concerning the very essence of the flesh; the which is now in heaven, and nowhere else; as hath been before shewed in the first observation upon the Confession of Augsburg.

counsel, that men do not think that their sins be forgiven them for this work's sake, or for this obedience; but that in a sure confidence they behold the death and merit of the Son of God, and His resurrection, and assure themselves that their sins are forgiven for His sake, and that He will have this faith to be confirmed by this admonition and testimony. When as faith, comfort, joy of conscience, and thanksgiving, do, after this sort, increase, the receiving is profitable. Neither are any admitted to the communion, except they be first heard and absolved of the pastor, or his fellow-ministers. In this trial the ruder sort are asked, and oftentimes instructed, touching the whole doctrine; and then is absolution published.

Also men are taught, that sacraments are actions instituted of God; and that without the use whereunto they are ordained, the things themselves are not to be accounted for a sacrament; but that, in the use appointed, Christ is present in this communion, truly and substantially,* and the body and blood of Christ indeed given to the receivers; that Christ doth witness that He is in them, and doth make them His members;† and that He doth wash them in His blood: as Hilary also saith, "These things, being eaten and drunk, do cause, both that we may be in Christ, and that Christ may be in us.

Moreover, in the ceremony itself, we observe the usual order of the whole ancient Church, both Latin and Greek. We use no private masses; that is, such wherein the body and blood of Christ was not distributed: as also the ancient Church, for many years after the apostles' times, had no such masses; as the old descriptions, which are to be found in Dionysius, Epiphanius, Ambrose, Augustine, and others, do shew. And Paul doth command that the communion should be celebrated when many do meet together (1 *Cor.* xi., 33). Therefore, in the public congre-

* See the first and second observation upon the Confession of Augsburg.

† Both these also we do embrace, as is contained in the word of God; namely, so that this whole dwelling be by His power and efficacy, and that the flesh of Christ be communicated unto us, yet after a spiritual and mystical manner; as hath been declared of us before, both in the Confession of Bohemia and of Augsburg.

gation, and such as is of good behaviour, prayers and the creed are rehearsed or sung, and lessons, appointed usually for holy-days, are read. After that, there is a sermon of the benefits of the Son of God, and of some part of doctrine, as the order of time doth minister an argument. Then the pastor doth rehearse a thanksgiving, and a prayer for the whole Church, for them that are in authority, and as the present necessity requireth; and he prayeth to God that, for His Son's sake, whom He would have to be made a sacrifice for us, He would forgive us our sins, and save us, and gather and preserve a Church. Then he rehearseth the words of Christ, concerning the institution of the Supper; and he himself taketh, and distributeth to the receivers, the whole sacrament; who come reverently thereunto, being before examined and absolved, and there they join theirs with the public prayers. In the end they do again give thanks. All men, which are not altogether ignorant of antiquity, do know that this rite and this communion doth, for the most part, agree with the writings of the apostles, and with the custom of the ancient Church, even almost to Gregory's time. Which thing being so, the custom of our churches is to be approved, not to be disallowed; but our adversaries, misliking our custom, do defend many errors, some more foul and gross, others coloured with new deceit.

Many heretofore have written, that in the mass there is an oblation made for the quick and the dead; and that it doth deserve remission of sins, both for him that maketh it, and for others, even for the work's sake. And this persuasion of very many was, and yet is, like unto that of the Pharisees and the heathen. For after the same manner the Pharisees and the heathen did dream, that they, for the work's sake, did deserve, for themselves and for others, remission of sins, peace, and many other good things. Or although those, which were not so blind, did speak more modestly, and say that they did deserve, but not without the good intention of the sacrificer; yet they imagined that those sacrifices were merits, and a ransom. By reason of this opinion, there were a multitude of sacrifices, and the crafty

means of gain were increased. Such is the merchandise of masses, and the profanation of the Lord's Supper, almost throughout the whole world. But God will have corrupt kinds of worship to be reproved and abolished. Therefore we do simply, and indeed, propound the voice of God, which doth condemn those errors; and with all our heart we affirm before God, and the whole Church in heaven and in earth, that there was one only sacrifice propitiatory, or whereby the wrath of the Eternal Father against mankind is pacified: to wit, the whole obedience of the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who was crucified and raised up again. This is that only "Lamb, which taketh away the sins of the world" (*John* i., 29). Of this only sacrifice it is said, "By one only sacrifice He made perfect for ever those that are sanctified" (*Heb.* x., 14). And this sacrifice is applied to every one, by their own faith, when they hear the Gospel, and use the sacraments. As Paul saith, "Whom God hath set forth to be a reconciliation through faith in His blood" (*Rom.* iii., 25). And Habakkuk: "The just shall live by His faith" (*Hab.* ii., 4). And Peter, "Being sanctified by the Spirit, unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 *Pet.* i., 2). Other sacraments in the Old Testament were typical; whereof we shall speak more at large in their place: and they did not deserve any remission of sins. And all the righteousness of holy men at all times were, are, and shall be sacrifices of praise; which do not deserve remission, either for them that offer them, or for others. But they are services which every one ought to perform, and are acceptable to God for the mediator, and our high priest, the Son of God, His sake; as it is said, "By Him we offer the sacrifice of praise always to God" (*Heb.* xiii., 15).

That this is an unchangeable and eternal truth, it is most manifest. And whereas certain fragments, which they call the canons of the mass are alleged against this so clear light of the truth, it is also manifest that the Greek and Latin canons are very unlike the one to the other; and that the Greek canons do disagree among themselves in the most weighty matter; and that, in

the Latin canon, many jaggs and pieces were, by little and little, patched together of ignorant authors. The ancient Church doth use the names of *sacrifice* and *oblation:* but thereby it understandeth the whole action, prayers, reception, remembrance, faith, confession, and thanksgiving. This whole inward and outward action, in every one that is turned to God, and in the whole Church, is indeed a sacrifice of praise or thanksgiving, and a reasonable service. And when the Lord saith, "The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth" (*John* iv., 23), he affirmeth, that in the New Testament outward sacrifices are not commanded; which, of necessity, should be made, although there were no motions of the Holy Ghost in the heart; as in the law it was necessary that the ceremony of the passover should be kept. But touching the Supper of the Lord, it is said, "Let every man examine himself," &c. (1 *Cor.* xi., 28). So the Supper of the Lord doth profit him that useth it, whereas he bringeth with him repentance and faith; and another man's work doth nothing at all profit him.

Furthermore, concerning the dead, it is manifest that all this shew is repugnant to the words of the institution of the Supper, wherein it is said, "Take ye, eat ye," &c. (*Mark* xiv., 22). "Do ye this in remembrance of me" (*Luke* xxii., 19). What doth this appertain to the dead, or to those that be absent? And yet, in a great part of Europe, many masses are said for the dead: also a great number, not knowing what they do, do read masses for a reward. But seeing that all these things are manifestly wicked, (to wit, to offer, as they speak, to the end that they may deserve for the quick and the dead; or for a man to do he knoweth not what), they do horribly sin that retain and defend these mischievous deeds. And seeing that this ceremony is not to be taken for a sacrament without the use whereunto it was ordained, what manner of idol worship is there used, let godly and learned men consider. Also it is a manifest profanation, to carry about part of the Supper of the Lord, and to adore it; where a part is utterly transferred to an use clean contrary to the first institution; when, as

the text saith, "Take, eat" (*Mark* xiv., 22); and this shew is but a thing devised of late. To conclude: what be the manners of many priests and monks in all Europe, which have no regard of this saying, "Let every man examine himself:" also, "Whosoever taketh it unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord?" (1 *Cor.* xi., 27, 28). Every man of himself doth know these things.

Now, although the chief-priests and hypocrites, who seek delusions to establish these evils, do scoff at these complaints; yet it is most certain that God is grievously offended with these wicked deeds, as He was angry with the people of Israel for their profanations of the sacrifices. And we do see evident examples of wrath; to wit, the ruins of so many kingdoms, the spoil and waste that the Turks do make in the world, the confusions of opinions, and many most lamentable dissipations of churches. But, O Son of God, Lord Jesus Christ, which wast crucified and raised up again for us; thou which art the High Priest of the Church; with true sighs we beseech Thee that, for Thine and Thy eternal Father's glory, Thou wouldest take away idols, errors, and abominations. And, as Thou Thyself didst pray, Sanctify us with Thy truth, and kindle the light of Thy Gospel, and true invocation, in the hearts of many; and bow our hearts to true obedience, that we may thankfully praise Thee in all eternity! The greatness of our sins, which the profanation of the Supper of the Lord these many years hath brought forth, doth surpass the eloquence of angels and men!

We are, herein, the shorter, seeing that no words can be devised sufficient to set out the greatness of this thing; and, in this great grief, we beseech the Son of God, that He would amend these evils; and, also, for a further declaration, we offer ourselves to them that will hear it. But, in this question, we see that to be chiefly done, which Solomon saith, "He that singeth songs to a wicked heart, is like him that poureth vinegar upon nitre" (*Prov.* xxv., 20). Our adversaries know, that these persuasions of their sacrifice are the sinews of their power and riches; therefore they will hear nothing that is said against it. Some of them do now

learn craftily to mitigate these things, and, therefore, they say, the oblation is not a merit, but an application; they deceive in words, and retain still the same abuses. But we said before, that every one doth by faith apply the sacrifice of Christ to himself, both when he heareth the Gospel, and then, also, when he useth the sacraments; and it is written, "Let every man examine himself" (1 *Cor.* xi., 28). Therefore Paul doth not mean that the ceremony doth profit another that doth not use it. And the Son of God Himself did offer up Himself, going into the holy of holies, that is, into the secret counsel of the Divinity, seeing the will of the eternal Father, and bearing His great wrath, and understanding the causes of this wonderful counsel. These weighty things are meant, when the text saith, "He offered Himself" (*Heb.* ix., 26), and when it saith, "He will make his soul an offering for sin" (*Isa.* liii., 10). Now, therefore, what do the priests mean, who say that they offer up Christ? And yet antiquity never spake after this manner. But they do most grievously accuse us. They say, that we do take away the continual sacrifice, as did Antiochus, who was a type of antichrist. We answered before, that we do retain the whole ceremony of the apostolic Church; and this is the continual sacrifice, that the sincere doctrine of the Gospel should be heard, that God should be truly invocated; to conclude, as the Lord saith, it is "to worship the Father in spirit and in truth" (*John* iv., 23), we do, also, herein comprehend the true use of the sacraments. Seeing that we do retain all these things faithfully, we do with great reverence retain the continual sacrifice: they do abolish it, who many ways do corrupt true invocation, and the very Supper of the Lord; who command us to invocate dead men; who set out masses to sale; who boast, that by their oblation they do merit for others; who do mingle many mischievous errors with the doctrine of repentance and remission of sins; who will men to doubt, when they repent, whether they be in favour; who defile the Church of God with filthy lusts and idols. These men be like unto Antiochus, and not we, who endeavour to obey the Son of God, who saith, "If any man loveth me, he will keep my word" (*John* xiv., 23).

Article 15. *Of the Use of the whole Sacrament.*

Let sophistry be removed from the judgments of the Church. All men know that the Supper of the Lord is so instituted, that the whole sacrament may be given to the people; as it is written, "Drink all ye of this" (*Matt.* xxvi., 27). Also the custom of the ancient Church, both Greek and Latin, is well known. Therefore we must confess that the forbidding of one part is an unjust thing. It is great injury to violate the lawful testament of men; why, then, do the bishops violate the testament of the Son of God, which He hath sealed with His blood? But it is to be lamented that certain men should be so impudent as to feign sophistry against this so weighty an argument, that they may establish their prohibition; the refutation of whom, the matter being so clear and evident, we do omit.

In another place this Article is not distinguished from that which went before, but is thus joined with it:—To conclude, we must also speak in few things of the use of the whole sacrament. Let sophistry be removed, &c.

XI.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF WIRTEMBURG.

Chapter 19. *Of the Eucharist.*

The Confession of Wirtemburg was presented of the most renowned Prince and Lord, Christopher Duke of Wirtemburg and Tecca, Earl of Montbelliard, through his ambassadors, to the assembly of the Council of Trent, the 24th day of the month of January, in the year 1552.

We believe and confess that the Eucharist (for so it pleased our forefathers to call the Supper of the Lord) is a sacrament, instituted of Christ Himself, and that the use thereof is commended to the Church, even to the latter end of the world. But because the substance is one thing, and the use thereof another thing, therefore we will speak of these in order.

Touching the substance of the Eucharist, we thus think and teach; that the true body of Christ, and His true blood, is distributed in the Eucharist;* and we refute them that say, that the

* Look before in the first observation upon the confession of Augsburg.

bread and wine of the Eucharist are only signs of the absent body and blood of Christ.* Also, we believe that the omnipotency of God is so great, that in the Eucharist He may either annihilate the substance of bread and wine, or else change them into the body and blood of Christ:† but that God doth exercise this His absolute omnipotency in the Eucharist, we have no certain word of God for it; and it is evident, that the ancient Church was altogether ignorant of it. For, as in Ezekiel, where it is said of the city of Jerusalem, described on a tile,‡ "This is Jerusalem," it was not necessary that the substance of the tile should be changed into the substance of the city of Jerusalem; so when it is said of the bread, "This is my body," it is not necessary that the substance of bread should be changed into the substance of the body of Christ. But for the truth of the sacrament it is sufficient that the body of Christ is indeed present with the bread. And indeed the very necessity of the truth of the sacrament doth seem to require, that true bread should remain, with the true presence of the body of Christ. For, as to the truth of the sacra-

* We do believe, out of the word of God, and by the perpetual and evident agreement of the whole ancient and true Church, that the body of Christ hath always been, is, and shall be, circumscribed and local. Wherefore, as when He lived upon the earth, He was nowhere else; so now, also, being above in heaven, He is there, and nowhere else, in His substance, as Vigilius plainly affirmeth against Eutiches. Yet, for all that, we do not affirm that the very body of Christ is only or simply absent, or that the bread and wine are only simple and naked signs, or bare pictures, or nothing else but certain tokens of Christian profession. For in such sense is there one only action of the holy Supper, that yet notwithstanding it should be partly corporal, and celebrated upon the earth (in which respect we doubt not to say that Christ's body is as far distant from us as heaven is from the earth); partly heavenly, the mind and faith lifting up the heart unto God (in the which respect we acknowledge that the body of the Lord is present in the Supper to our mind and faith). But that they be bare and naked signs, how can we possibly affirm, which so often and so evidently have insisted upon this, that the things signified are no less certainly given unto the mind, than the signs themselves unto the body?

† We see not how God may be said to be able to do that which is manifestly repugnant to His own will, concerning the everlasting truth of Christ's body, as it hath been opened unto us in the word of God.

‡ For *a tile*, the old translation reads *the outside of a wall*, apparently mistaking *later*, in the Latin, for *latus*. But neither is the original confession free from error; for the words "This is Jerusalem," are not applied to the emblem of *the tile* in chapter iv., but to that of *the hair* in chapter v. of Ezekiel.—EDITOR.

ment of baptism it is necessary that, in the use thereof, there should be water, and that true water should remain; so it is necessary in the Lord's Supper, that there should be bread in the use thereof, and that true bread should remain: whereas, if the substance of bread were changed, we should have no proof of the truth of the sacrament. Whereupon, both Paul, and also the ancient ecclesiastical writers, do call the bread of the Eucharist, even after consecration, bread. "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread," &c. And, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily," &c. (1 *Cor.* xi., 27, 28). And Augustine, in his *Sermon to Young Children*, saith: "That which you have seen, it is the bread and the cup; the which thing also your eyes do witness unto you: but that which your faith desireth to learn, is this; the bread is the body of Christ, the cup is His blood."

Now, as touching the use of the Eucharist: first, although we do not deny but that whole Christ is distributed, as well in the bread as in the wine of the Eucharist;* yet we teach that the use of either part ought to be common to the whole Church. For it is evident that Christ, being nothing at all terrified by any dangers, which afterward human superstition invented, or by other devices, gave unto His Church both parts to be used. Also, it is evident that the ancient Church did use both parts for many years: and certain writers do clearly witness, that they which do receive bread alone, do not receive the whole sacrament sacramentally (for so they speak); and that it is not possible to divide one and the self-same mystery, without great sacrilege. Wherefore, we think that the use of both parts is indeed Catholic and apostolic, and that it is not lawful for any man, at his pleasure, to change this institution of Christ, and a ceremony of such con-

* But we say, by the institution of God, that His body, by the delivering of the bread, is given unto us as true meat; and that His blood, by the pouring of the wine, is given unto us as distinctly as true drink; yet both of them to be received with the mind and with faith, and not with the mouth. Notwithstanding, that by this dispensation (which, in respect of the thing signified, is distinctly made, and in regard of the signs themselves, severally distributed), nothing is divided in the humanity of Christ.

tinuance in the ancient and true Church, and to take away from the laity, as they call them, one part of the Eucharist. And it is to be marvelled at, that they who profess themselves to defend the ceremonies of the ancient Church, should so far swerve from the ancient Church in this point. Moreover, seeing that the word *sacrifice* is very large, and doth generally signify a holy worship; we do willingly grant, that the true and lawful use of the Eucharist may in this sense be called a sacrifice: howbeit the Eucharist, according to the institution of Christ, is so celebrated, that therein the death of Christ is shewed forth, and the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is distributed to the Church; and so it is truly called an applying of the merit of the passion of Christ, to wit, to them which receive the sacrament.

Neither do we condemn godly lessons, and prayers, which use to go before and to follow consecration, as they call it, and the dispensation of the Eucharist: yet, in the mean time, it is not lawful for us to dissemble, or to allow of those errors which have been added to this holy sacrament, rather by the ignorance of private men, than by any lawful consent of the true Catholic Church. One error is this, that of the worship, which ought to be common to the Church, there is made a private action of one priest; who, as he doth alone to himself mumble the words of the Lord's Supper, so also he alone doth receive the bread and wine. For Christ did institute the Eucharist, not that it should be a private action of one man, but that it should be a communion of the Church. Therefore, to the right action of the Eucharist, two persons at the least are requisite; to wit, the minister of the Eucharist, who blesseth, and he to whom the sacrament of the Eucharist is dispensed.* For, when Christ did institute this sacrament, He did not eat thereof alone, but He did dispense it to His Church, which then was present with Him, saying, "Take ye, eat ye," &c.: and, "Drink all ye of this," &c.

* This we do so grant to be true, that, notwithstanding we do also know that the Supper of the Lord is not private unto two, but that it appertaineth to the whole Church, or at the least to some one part of the same.

(*Matt.* xxvi., 26, 27). This institution of Christ, the ancient and true Catholic Church did so severely observe, that it excommunicated them, which, being present whilst this holy sacrament was administered, would not communicate with the rest. Anacletus, in his *first epistle*, saith, "After that consecration is finished, let all communicate, except they had rather stand without the church doors;" and he addeth, "For so both the apostles appointed, and the holy Church of Rome keepeth it still." Also, the Antiochian Council, chapter 2, saith, "All those which come into the Church of God, and hear the holy Scriptures, but do not communicate with the people in prayer, and cannot abide to receive the sacrament of the Lord, according to a certain proper discipline, these men must be cast out of the Church." Dionysius, in his book, "De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia," saith, "The bishop, when he hath praised the divine gifts, then he prepareth the very holy and most excellent mysteries. And those things which before he had praised, being covered and hid under venerable signs, he bringeth into sight, and, reverently shewing forth the divine gifts, both he himself doth turn to the holy participation thereof, and doth exhort the others to participate in them. To conclude, when the holy communion is received, and delivered to all, he, rendering thanks, doth make an end of these mysteries." Therefore we think it necessary to the retaining of the institution of Christ, in the celebration of the Eucharist, and that we may follow the example of the ancient and true Catholic Church, that the private masses of the priests be abrogated, and that the public communion of the Lord's Supper be restored.

Another error is this, that the Eucharist is such a sacrifice as ought to be offered daily in the Church, for the purging of the sins of the quick and the dead, and for the obtaining of other benefits, both corporal and spiritual. This error is evidently contrary to the Gospel of Christ, which witnesseth, "That Christ, by one oblation, once only made, hath made perfect for ever those that be sanctified" (*Heb.* x., 14). And because that Christ, by His passion and death, hath purchased remission of sins for us

(which, also, is declared unto us by the Gospel in the New Testament), therefore it is not lawful to sacrifice any more for sin; for the epistle to the Hebrews saith, "Where there is remission of sins, there is no further oblation for sin" (*Heb.* x., 18). For whereas Christ saith, "Do this in remembrance of me" (*Luke* xxii., 19), He doth not command to offer His body and blood in the Supper unto God, but to the Church; that the Church, by eating the body, and drinking the blood of Christ, and by shewing forth the benefit of His death, may be admonished of that oblation of the body and blood of Christ, which was once only on the cross for the purging of our sins. For so Paul doth interpret this saying of Christ, saying, "So often as ye shall eat (He doth not say offer) this bread, and drink this cup, shew ye forth the death of the Lord, till He come" (1 *Cor.* xi., 26). And truly we confess that the ancient ecclesiastical writers did call the Eucharist *a sacrifice* and *an oblation;* but they expound themselves that, by the name of sacrifice, they mean a remembrance, a shewing forth or preaching of that sacrifice, which Christ did once offer upon the cross; as, also, they call the memorial of the passover and of pentecost, the passover and pentecost itself.

The third error is this, that many do think, that the oblation (as they call it) of the Eucharist is not of itself a propitiation for sins, but that it doth apply the propitiation and merit of Christ to the quick and the dead. But we have already shewed, that the Eucharist properly is not an oblation, but is so called, because it is a remembrance of the oblation which was once made on the cross. Moreover, the application of the merit of Christ is not made by any other outward instrument, than by the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, and by the dispensing of those sacraments which Christ hath instituted for this use; and the merit of Christ, being offered and applied, is not received but by faith. "Preach the Gospel to every creature" (for by the ministry of the Gospel the benefits of Christ be offered and applied to creatures; that is, either to the Jews or to the Gentiles; and it followeth,) "He that shall believe and be baptized, he shall be saved;" (because

that by the receiving of the sacrament, and by faith, the benefits, offered and applied, be received), (*Mark* xvi., 15, 16). "The Gospel is the power of God to salvation, to every one that believeth" (*Rom.* i., 16), that is, the ministry of the Gospel is the instrument ordained of God, whereby God is able and effectual to save all those which believe the Gospel. Therefore the preaching of the Gospel doth offer, or, if it liketh any man so to speak, doth apply salvation to all men; but faith doth receive salvation, offered and applied. Now, in the private mass, bread and wine are so handled, that the priest doth neither publicly declare the Gospel of Christ, but doth softly mumble to himself certain words, and especially the words of the Supper, or of consecration; neither doth he distribute bread and wine to others, but he alone taketh them; therefore, there can be no applying of the merit of Christ in the private mass. This did our true Catholic elders well perceive; who, as we have declared before, did so severely require, that they which were present at the mass, and did not communicate, should be excommunicated.

The fourth error is this, which we have already touched; in that they do require that the words of the Supper, or of consecration, be rehearsed silently in the Eucharist; seeing that these words are a part of that Gospel, which, according to the commandment of Christ, is to be preached to all creatures. For, although our ancestors did sometimes call the Eucharist a *mystery*, yet they did not so call it with this purpose, that they would not have the words of the Supper to be rehearsed before the Church in the Eucharist publicly, and in a tongue commonly known; but because that in the Eucharist one thing is seen and another thing understood. For Christ Himself is also called a *mystery* (1 *Tim.* iii., 16); who, nevertheless, is not to be hid, but to be preached to all creatures. And because that, in the receiving of the sacrament, it is necessarily required that we should have faith, and "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (*Rom.* x., 17); it is most necessary that, in the Eucharist, the word of the Supper—that is, the word of the Son of God—should be pub-

licly rehearsed: for this word is the preaching of the Gospel, and the shewing forth of the death of Christ. Therefore that the Church may understand what is done in the Eucharist, and what is offered unto her to be received, and that she may confirm her faith, it is necessary that, in the Eucharist, the words of the Lord's Supper should be rehearsed publicly.

The fifth error is this, that one part of the Eucharist is used in shew of a singular worship of God, to be carried about, and to be laid up. But the Holy Ghost doth forbid that any worship of God should be appointed without the express commandment of God. "Ye shall not do, every one of you, that which seemeth good in his own eyes" (*Deut.* xii., 8). And again: "That which I command thee, that only shalt thou do to the Lord: see that thou add nothing thereunto, nor detract anything from it" (*ver.* 32). And, "in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the precepts of men" (*Matt.* xv., 9). Clemens, in his "Second Epistle to James," and "*De Consecr. Dist.* 2, *cap. Tribus*," saith, "Certainly let so great burnt-offerings be offered on the altar, as may be sufficient for the people; but if so be that any remain till the next day, let them not be kept, but with fear and trembling, by the diligence of the clerks let them be consumed." We are not ignorant how they used to elude these words of Clemens, by feigning a difference betwixt the work of those that are ready to die, and of those that be ready to consecrate. But it is evident that the bread, which useth to be carried about, and to be laid up to be adored, is not reserved for those that be weak, but in the end is received of them that do consecrate. Cyril, or, as others think, Origen, "Upon the Seventh Chapter of Leviticus," saith, "For the Lord, concerning that bread which he gave to His disciples, said unto them, 'Take it, and eat it,' &c. He did not defer it, neither did He command it to be reserved till the next day. Peradventure, there is this mystery also contained therein, that He doth not command the bread to be carried in the highway, that thou mayest always bring forth the fresh loaves of the word of God, which thou carriest within thee," &c.

XII.—FROM THE CONFESSION OF SUEVELAND.

Chapter 18. *Of the Eucharist.*

The Confession of the Four Cities was presented, both in the German and also in the Latin tongue, to the same most sacred emperor, Charles V., in the same assembly held at Augsburg, in the same year, by the ambassadors of the cities of Strasburg, Constance, Meinengen, and Linden. And we have in the titles called it the Confession of Sueveland, for that those four cities, by whom it was presented, are commonly counted neighbours to Sueveland.

As touching this venerable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, all those things which the evangelists, Paul, and the holy Fathers have left in writing thereof, our men do sincerely teach, commend, and inculcate. And thence they do, with a singular endeavour, always publish this goodness of Christ towards His own, whereby He doth no less at this day than He did in that His last Supper, vouchsafe to give, by the sacraments, His true body and His true blood, to be eaten and to be drunk, indeed, as the meat and drink of their souls, whereby they may be nourished unto life eternal. He giveth it, I say, to all those who, from their hearts, have given their names to be reckoned among His disciples, when as they do receive this Supper, according to His institution; so that now He may live and abide in them, and they in Him, and be raised up by Him in the last day to a new and immortal life, according to those words of eternal truth, "Take and eat, this is my body," &c.; "Drink all ye of this; this cup is my blood," &c. (*Matt.* xxvi., 26—28). Now, our preachers do most diligently withdraw the minds of the people, both from all contention, and also from all superfluous and curious inquiry, unto that which only is profitable, and whereunto only Christ our Saviour had respect; to wit, that, being fed with Him, we may live in Him, and through Him, and lead such a life as is acceptable to God, holy, and therefore everlasting and blessed; and withal, that we, among ourselves, may be one bread and one body, which are partakers of one bread in that holy Supper. Whereby it cometh to pass, that we do very religiously and with a singular

reverence, both administer and receive the divine sacraments; that is, the holy Supper of Christ. By these things (which are thus, indeed, as we have set them down), your sacred majesty, O most gracious emperor, doth know how falsely our adversaries do boast, that our men do change the words of Christ, and tear them in pieces by human glosses; that in our Suppers nothing is administered but mere bread and mere wine; and also that among us the Supper of the Lord is contemned and rejected. For our men do very carefully teach and exhort, that every man do, in a simple faith, embrace these words of the Lord, rejecting all devices of men, and false glosses; and, removing away all kinds of wavering, do wholly addict their mind to the true meaning thereof; and, to conclude, do oftentimes, with as great reverence as they may, receive the sacraments, to be the lively food of their souls, and to stir up in them a grateful remembrance of so great a benefit; the which thing also useth now to be done among us, much more often and reverently than heretofore was used. Moreover, our preachers have always hitherto, and at this day do offer themselves with all modesty and truth, to render a reason of their faith and doctrine, touching all those things which they believe and teach, as well about the sacrament as about other things, and that not only to your sacred majesty, but also to every one that shall demand it.

Chapter 19. *Of the Mass.*

Furthermore, seeing that after this manner Christ hath instituted His Supper, which afterward began to be called the mass; to wit, that therein the faithful, being fed with His body and blood unto life eternal, should shew forth His death, whereby they are redeemed: our preachers, by this mean giving thanks, and also commending this salvation unto others, could not choose but condemn it, that these things were everywhere neglected. And, on the other side, they which do celebrate the masses, do presume to offer up Christ unto His Father for the quick and the dead; and they make the mass to be such a work, as that, by it alone almost the favour of God and salvation is obtained, how-

soever they do either believe or live. Whereupon that most shameful, and twice and thrice impious, sale of this sacrament hath crept in; and thereby it is come to pass, that nothing at this day is more gainful than the mass. Therefore, they rejected private masses, because the Lord did commend this sacrament to His disciples, to be used in common. Whereupon Paul commandeth the Corinthians, when they are to celebrate the holy Supper, to stay one for another; and denieth that they do celebrate the Lord's Supper, when as every man taketh His own Supper whilst they be eating (1 *Cor.* xi., 33; 20). Moreover, whereas they boast, that they do offer up Christ instead of a sacrifice, they are therefore condemned of our men, because that the Epistle to the Hebrews doth plainly witness, that, as men do once die, so Christ was once offered, that He might take away the sins of many, and that He can no more be offered again, than He may die again (*Heb.* ix., 25—28). And, therefore, having offered one sacrifice for sins, He sitteth for ever at the right hand of God, waiting for that which remaineth; to wit, that His enemies, as it were a footstool, may be trodden under His feet: for with one oblation hath He consecrated for ever them that are sanctified (*Heb.* x., 12—14).

And whereas they have made the mass to be a good work, whereby any thing may be obtained at God's hands, our preachers have taught, that it is repugnant to that which the Scripture doth teach in every place; that we are justified, and receive the favour of God, by the Spirit of Christ, and by faith: for which matter, we alleged before many testimonies out of the Scriptures. So, in that the death of the Lord is not commended to the people in the mass, our preachers have shewed that it is contrary to that which Christ commanded, to receive these sacraments in remembrance of Himself (*Luke* xxii., 19); and Paul, that we might shew forth the death of Christ till He come (1 *Cor.* xi., 26). And whereas many do commonly celebrate the masses, without all regard of godliness, only for this cause, that they may nourish their bodies, our preachers have shewed, that that is so execrable a thing before

God, that if the mass, of itself, should nothing at all hinder godliness, yet worthily, and by the commandment of God, it were to be abolished: the which thing is evident, even out of Isaiah only (*ch.* ii., 18). For our God is a Spirit, and truth, and therefore He cannot abide to be worshipped but in spirit and truth (*John* iv., 24). And how grievous a thing this unreasonable selling of the sacraments is unto the Lord, our preachers would have men thereby to conjecture, that Christ did so sharply, and altogether against His accustomed manner, taking unto Himself an external kind of revengement, cast out of the temple those that bought and sold (*Matt.* xxi., 12): whereas they might seem to exercise merchandise only in this respect, that they might further those sacrifices which were offered according to the law.

Therefore, seeing that the rite of the mass, which was wont to be celebrated, is so many ways contrary to the Scripture of God, as also it is in every respect diverse from that which the holy Fathers used, it hath been very vehemently condemned amongst us out of the pulpit, and, by the word of God, been made so detestable, that many, of their own accord, have altogether forsaken it; and elsewhere, by the authority of the magistrate, it is abrogated. The which thing we have not taken upon us for any other cause than for that, throughout the whole Scripture, the Spirit of God doth detest nothing so much, neither command it so earnestly to be taken away, as a feigned and false worship of Himself. Now, no man that hath any spark of religion in him, can be ignorant, what an inevitable necessity is laid upon him that feareth God, when, as he is persuaded, that God doth require a thing at his hands. For any man may easily foresee how many would take it at our hands, that we should change anything about the holy rite of the mass; neither were there any which would not rather have chosen, in this point, not only not to have offended your sacred majesty, but even any prince of the lowest degree. But when as here withal they did not doubt, but that, by that common rite of the mass, God was most grievously provoked, and that His glory, for the which we ought to spend

our lives, was darkened, they could not but take it away, lest that they also, by winking at it, should make themselves partakers with them in diminishing the glory of God. Truly, if God is to be loved and worshipped above all, godly men must tolerate nothing less, than that which He doth hate and detest. And that this one cause did constrain us to change certain things in these points, we take Him to witness, from whom no secret is hid.

Such is the summary of Protestant doctrine, as it presents itself to us in the authoritative confessions of the various leading churches of Europe. To say that they are identical, would be to assert more than a comparison of them would warrant: to declare them all at variance, and little consistent with each other, would be to hazard an assertion destitute of any foundation in truth. It may fearlessly be asserted that, in all important points, they agree, whether in profession or protestation. They generally agree in what they require and what they reject. This could surely not have been the result of accident; for to suppose that men, far removed from each other, of different nations and of differing speech, should, by some hap-hazard good fortune, come to such agreement, is to ignore all our experience of human affairs. This agreement has been before noticed, not as first existing in the sixteenth century, but in the antecedent succession of ages, when occasions called for confessions and protestations.

It is unnecessary for me to indicate the origin of this common agreement in the positive and the negative of Protestant confessions. *That* is sufficiently seen in the one only recognised basis of authority among them all; viz., the Holy Scriptures. There may be differences as to the amount of deference to be allowed to Church authority, or the independency of private judgment, and the sophistry of adversaries may make much of such differences; but the proof of the consent of common sense with Church authority, and the absence of *practical* difficulty, whatever of *theoretical* men may conjure up, shew that the word of God is a safe guide, not leading to confusion, but to peace and unity in

the churches of the saints. It was a simple knowledge of the Scriptures, and the illumination of the Holy Spirit, which brought about the work of the Reformation, and made it what it is. On the subject of the Lord's Holy Supper, the several expressions are consentaneous, and all fearlessly referred for their authority to the unerring Word. Adhering to the same, whatever *verbal* alterations the lapse of time may make desirable, or even necessary, no man need be afraid of the divine authority of his faith, nor, if held in sincerity, can such faith be unproductive of good works. Here faith and its fruits have been seen for centuries, in happy combination and vigorous exercise, bringing glory to God and happiness to man, while the system to which our doctrine is opposed has been openly proved the blight of the creature's happiness, and the annihilation of the glory of the Creator. I will now proceed to shew that there were other churches, even in the middle ages, in which the fatal doctrines of Rome had no influence whatever: when the attempt was made to induce or compel uniformity, the effort failed, leaving us a more striking evidence that the decrees of Lateran and of Trent were unknown, in the earlier ages, to churches independent of Italian influences.

CHAPTER V.

THE BELIEF OF THE GREEK CHURCH ON THE ARTICLE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

I HAVE purposely abstained, hitherto, from producing any authorities from the later Greek Church, to shew that it did not agree with the Roman, because I intended to give a brief sketch of its belief on the subject of our enquiry separately. I will now proceed to do so, following, in great measure, Mons. Claude,* in his reply to Arnaud, who has thoroughly examined every branch of the subject, and very satisfactorily shewn that there is more disparity between the doctrine of the Greek and Roman Churches, than between the Greek and English. It will be seen, in short, that the Greek Church has retained most of the phraseology of the very early Greek Fathers, but that the Church of Rome has run from the more sober statements of Augustine, even far beyond the figurative and poetical language of the primitive Greek Fathers, till they have interpreted, with the strictest literalness, every flowery and imaginative expression of the first ages.

Now, the decided difference which exists between the Greek and Roman Church, is plainly seen in the fact, that in no one work of a pure Greek is there any such word as that of μετουσίωσις (transubstantiation) ever used, with reference to the sacramental change, notwithstanding that efforts have been perseveringly sustained to bring about a perfect identity of faith and confession by the Church of Rome.† The Greeks, however, have adhered to their general terms,

* See Claude's Catholic Doct. of Euch. in all Ages, book iii.

† Ibid. book ii., c. 5, for instances.

μεταβάλλεσθαι, μεταποίεισθαι, μεταβαίνειν, μεταῤῥυθμίζειν, μετασκευάζειν, &c. Now, when we come to consider this argument, it is of great weight; for there could be no difficulty in the use of a word by the Greek Church, if that word properly expressed their belief,—nay, if it had done so, it could not well have been avoided by their theological writers. But no such word is found in the works of John Damascene, Nicephorus, the patriarch of Constantinople, Photius, Theophilact, Oecumenius, Zonaras, Germain, Balsamon, Nicetas Choniatus, Cabasilas, Marc of Ephesus, Feremias the patriarch, Metrophanus, and as many others whose works are extant, nor any such expression as supports the idea of transubstantiation. And this will appear much more remarkable, if we call to mind the definite and careful language finally adopted by the Western Church, as it is seen in the decrees and catechisms of councils and popes. This was clearly exemplified in the experience of Mr. Basire, who, being the king's chaplain, visited the Greek Churches about the middle of the seventeenth century. In writing to Mr. Claude, he says, "The Greek Church does nowhere teach transubstantiation. I mean in their public symbols, confessions and catechisms, &c.; several of which I have, upon this account, carefully perused, but could not find in any of them the least trace either of this term of transubstantiation, or the thing itself signified thereby, which doctrine was altogether unknown to the Greek Fathers. I matter not some private doctors amongst them; for I know that a certain monk, of the number of these false Greeks, had secretly inserted μετουσίωσις (transubstantiation) in his catechism, which I saw at Constantinople; but he was severely checked for it by the true Greeks."* And this difference becomes still more marked, when

* Dico in specie Ecclesiam Græcam, transubstantiationem nullibi asserere, neque voce, neque re. De publicis instrumentis, puta symbolis, confessionibus, catechismis, &c., intellegi volo: quorum plurima pervolvi ad indaginem, neque in eorum vel unico, μετουσίωσεως vocis, ut et rei ipsius, priscis patribus Græcis prorsus ignotæ vel vola vel vestigium. Privatos eorum doctores nil moror, quoniam non sum nescius quemdam ipsorum pseudo-Græcorum hieromonachum in suam catechesin quam mihi videre licuit Constantinopoli, illam vocem μετουσίωσεως intrusisse, qui vel ideo verorum Græcorum censuram haud effugit.

we compare the language of the false and true Greeks; that is, of those who have adopted the creed of the Church of Rome, and of those who have not. In the former, there is found all that we find in the writers of the West, with a constant reference to substance, accidents, &c.; but in the pure Greeks, the expressions are always general, and without any special or particular references of any sort.

It is also manifest that the writers of the modern Greek Church, even when using strong language, did not mean to teach the Romish doctrine; for they use expressions equally strong, when they speak on other subjects. I will give but one instance: many more may be seen in Claude's Catholic Doctrine, book iii. The quotation is from Cabasilas, archbishop of Thessalonica, about the year 1350. He writes:

"The Church is represented, in the mysteries of religion, not as in the signs; but as the members are in the heart, the branches of the tree in the root, and the vine-leaves in the vine, as speaks our Lord. For here is not only a communion of names, or a reference of likeness, but it is the identity of the thing itself; for the mysteries are the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Now they are the real nourishment of the Church, and when she partaketh of them she doth not change them into a human body, like unto other food, but she herself is changed into them, *μεταβάλλεται εἰς ἐκεῖνα*, forasmuch as the most excellent part has the predominancy. Behold the iron, when it is joined with the fire, it becomes fire, and it does not make the fire become iron, for the fire effaces all the properties of the iron; so, in like manner, if any one could see the Church of Christ in that respect, whereby it is united to Him and partakes of His flesh, he would behold nothing but the body of Christ; and therefore St. Paul says, you are the body of Christ and each of you are His members; for, when he calls Him the head and us the members, he does not represent to us thereby the cares of His providence, nor our subject to Him in the same sense as we call ourselves the members of our parents or friends, by an hyperbolical way of speaking. But he means what he says: that the faithful, by the efficacy of the blood, live the life which is in Jesus Christ, and have their real dependence on Him as their head and are clothed with His body."

Mr. Claude, in remarking on Mr. Arnaud's partial quoting of this passage, says: "It needs not now be demanded of Mr. Arnaud,

why he cut short this passage of Cabasilas, seeing the reason manifestly appears; for if we take but the pains to compare what he alleges from this author touching the Eucharist, with what I now related touching the Church, we shall soon find that these last expressions are far stronger and more significant than what he says concerning the sacrament. He excludes the bare communion of name and resemblance between Christ and the Church, and establishes a perfect identity. He says the Church is changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. He uses the comparison of iron inflamed, which others apply to the Eucharist; and, as if he designed to make us understand that the Church is Christ's body, in a literal and complete sense, he assures us this is no hyperbole, and that St. Paul speaks the same thing. I am greatly deceived, if there can be anything found so pressing and comprehensive in relation to the Eucharist, either in this author, or any other of the true Greeks; and this shews, on one hand, how vain and groundless Mr. Arnaud's triumphs are, and, on the other, how requisite and necessary a thing it is for men to shew the substantial conversion, clearly and expressly, in the doctrines of a Church, before it be concluded she believes it."*

But that the Greeks do not believe that the consecration makes the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, in the sense in which the Church of Rome receives and teaches that doctrine, is at once sufficiently manifest, from the way in which they speak of, and act towards, the unconsecrated elements, and particular portions of them, specially separated. The following, from Claude's "Catholic Doctrine," will shew clearly what I mean:

"We may likewise see here another example of what I say, even in the very bread of the Eucharist before its consecration. The Greeks have two tables, one which they call the prothesis and the other the great altar. They place on the former of these the symbols, and express, by divers mystical actions, part of the economy of the Son of God, that is to say, His birth, life, and sufferings. They solemnly carry them afterwards to the great altar, where they consecrate them,

* Claude's Cath. Doct. bk. iii. c. 2.

so that, before this, it is but simple bread and wine, yet on which they represent the principal passages of the life of Christ, and they say themselves that then the bread and wine are but a type or figure; yet do they speak concerning them almost after the same manner before they are consecrated as after. Germain, the patriarch of Constantinople, calls them the body and blood of Jesus Christ; he says that the saints and all the just enter with Him, and that the cherubims, angels, and all the host of immaterial spirits march before Him, singing hymns and accompanying the great King our Saviour Christ, who comes to His mystical sacrifice and is carried by mortal hands. Behold, says he, the angels that come with the holy gifts; that is to say, with the body and blood of Jesus Christ, from Mount Calvary to the sepulchre. And in another place, the translation of holy things, to wit, of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, which come from the prothesis, and are carried to the great altar, with the cherubic hymn, signifies the entrance of our Saviour, Christ, from Bethany into Jerusalem. He says, moreover, that our Saviour is carried in the dish, and shews Himself in the bread, *Χριστὸν ἐν τῷ ἄρτῳ ὁρώμενον*. And as yet it is no more than bread and wine unconsecrated.

"Arcudius observes, some call this bread the dead body of Jesus Christ. He says, farther, that Gabriel de Philadelphia calls it the imperfect body of Christ, and proves the symbols are called in this respect, *ἅγια, θεῖα, ἀῤῥητα, καὶ ἄχραντα μυστήρια*, the holy, divine, and unutterable mysteries, which are the same names they give them after their consecration.*

"When they carry them from the prothesis to the great altar, the choir loudly sing that which they call the cherubic hymn, in which are these words, 'Let the King of kings, and Lord of lords, Jesus Christ our God, draw near to be sacrificed, and given to the faithful for food.' At which time their devotion is so excessive, that Arcudius did not scruple to accuse the Greeks in this respect of idolatry.† Goar clears them of this crime, yet says himself that some bow, others kneel and cast themselves prostrate on the ground, as being to receive the King of the world invisibly accompanied with His holy angels, that all of them say their prayers or recommend themselves to the prayers of the priests, and that they usually speak to our Saviour Christ, as if He was personally present, praying to Him, in the words of the good thief, 'Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom.'‡ The priests answer, 'The Lord God be mindful of us all, now and for ever.'

* Arcud. lib. de Euch. c. 20, 21. † Ibid. lib. iii. de Euch.
‡ Goar in Euch. notis in Miss. Chrys.

"They repeat these words without ceasing, till he that carries the symbols is entered the sanctuary, and then they cry out, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' And yet, so far, there is not any consecration, and much less a conversion of substance.

"Whilst the symbols are still on the table, they separate a particle from the rest of the bread in remembrance of our Saviour, and call the remainder the body of the Virgin Mary. They afterwards lay another small piece on the right side of the first, in honour of the holy Virgin, to the end they may say, in effect says Goar, *παρέστιν ἡ βασιλίσσα ἐκ δεξιῶν σοῦ ἐν ἱματισμῷ χρυσῷ περιβλημένη πεποικιλμένῃ*—'The queen is at Thy right hand, in a vestment of gold wrought with divers colours.' They set by another small piece in honour of St. John Baptist, another in honour of the apostles, and several others for a remembrance of other saints. Goar tells us, they separate nine pieces after this manner, besides those of our Saviour, and the blessed Virgin His mother, and that this is done to represent the whole celestial court.* They afterwards carry all these to the great altar, where the consecration is performed; but when they speak of these particles, they call one of them the body of the Virgin Mary, the other the body of St. John, the other the body of St. Nicholas, and after the same manner all the rest. I know Goar denies they are thus called, affirming the Greeks say only *θεοτόκου μερίδα*, 'the particle of the Virgin,' and not 'the body of the Virgin.' I know, likewise, that Arcudius seems not to be agreed in this point: and perhaps the Latins have at length caused the Latinised Greeks to leave this way of speaking. But Goar himself says, that some amongst the Latins have been so simple to imagine, that the Greeks believe the real presence of the body of the blessed Virgin in her particle of bread; and what likelihood is there persons, endued with the least sense, should fall into this opinion, if the expressions of the Greeks gave them not some reason for it? Arcudius assures us that, in his time, there was a certain person in Poland, otherwise both pious and learned, who persuaded a lady of Russia to receive no more the sacrament from the hands of the priests of her religion, because they administered not the body of Jesus Christ, but that of the Virgin Mary and St. Nicholas, &c.† This man's mistake, to whom Arcudius gives another kind of character than that of a calumniator, was no otherwise occasioned but by the manner of speaking usual amongst the Greeks, who called these particles the body of this or the other saint. For it is not likely he invented this fable himself, which is so impertinent and

* Goar in Euch, notis in Miss. Chrys. † Arcud. lib. iii. de Euch. c. 9.

ridiculous. Hottinger affirms,* there is to be seen in the library of Zurich a manuscript, which bears the name of one Peter Numagen, in which is expressly mentioned that the Greeks affirm the remainder of the consecrated bread (which is to say, of that bread from whence the great particle has been taken in remembrance of our Saviour, and which they distribute to the people at the end of the action, calling it *ἀντιδωρον*), to be the remainder of the body of the Virgin Mary. Guy Carmus relates the same thing: 'the thirteenth error of the Greeks,' says he, 'is, that they affirm the remainder of the consecrated bread to be the remains of the body of the blessed Virgin.'

"Germain, the patriarch of Constantinople, speaks after this manner. 'We need not doubt,' says he, 'but there are great spiritual blessings and advantages which do follow from the communication of this bread, which is the body of the blessed Virgin.'† And the same kind of expressions are to be seen in Boucher's relation touching the Greeks. 'They all of them hold,' says he, 'a most ridiculous and extravagant opinion; for they believe that, under these particles of the consecrated host, is really contained the body of the Virgin, after the same manner as the body of her Son under the principal parts of the said host, so that they receive these fragments with new prayers and preparatives in honour of the mother of our Saviour.'‡ I do not doubt but that Boucher is mistaken, as well as those mentioned by Goar, and this good man of Poland, mentioned by Arcudius, in imputing to them such a ridiculous superstition; but it is certain the occasion of this charge was the manner of the Greeks expressing themselves, who attribute to these fragments and particles of bread the name of the body of the Virgin and saints in the same manner as they call the great particle our Saviour's body."

Now, these passages must be really very troublesome to a Romanist, for they prove too much for his doctrine. The language, the procession, the prostrations, would all do very well to prove all that he requires, only, unfortunately, they are used of and to the bread and wine *unconsecrated*, and of those portions which are never consecrated for a sacramental use. It is not to be denied, indeed, that these expressions, and the conduct which accompanies them, are highly censurable as superstitious in themselves, and likely to convey erroneous notions; but they entirely ignore the idea of a substantial transmutation, as all confess,

* Histor. Eccl., part iv., p. 20. † Theoria rer. Eccles.
‡ Sacred Nosegay, lib. iv., c. 3.

though no general words could more strongly express such an idea than those which have been quoted.

The next point to which I shall allude, in which the Greek Church shew themselves not only not coincident with, but antagonistic to, the Church of Rome, is in what they teach of those who receive the body and blood of Christ in the holy communion. It has been already shewn that Augustine, and the other early Fathers, most emphatically teach that no profane person, no unworthy communicant, can receive the thing signified in the Lord's Supper. It is apparent that the doctrine of transubstantiation necessarily involves the reception of the inward as well as the outward part by all. Now, the Greeks are clear upon this point; and if they were not, we have only to call in as witnesses the writers of the Church of Rome, who have been engaged controversially with them, to prove the point. The following will shew that in this matter the Greek Church is decidedly Protestant in its character, and can by no possibility believe as Trent decrees, and Rome to-day teaches.

"It is an opinion generally received amongst the Greeks, that the wicked who participate of the Eucharist, do not receive the body of Jesus Christ. And that they do hold this opinion may be proved by the testimony of several good authors.

"Prateolus expressly mentions this amongst their errors. 'They affirm,' says he, 'that those who live in the practice of any known sin do not receive the body of Jesus Christ, although they draw near to the table of our Lord, and receive the consecrated bread from the hands of the priest.'*

"Possevin, the Jesuit, confirms the same thing. 'They err,' says he, 'in affirming those that are defiled with sin do not receive the Lord's body when they come to the altar.'†

"Nicholas Cabasilas does fully set forth the belief of the Greek Church touching this point. 'The causes,' says he, 'of our sanctification, or, if you will, the dispositions which our Saviour requires of us, are purity of soul and love of God, an earnest desire to partake of the sacrament, and such a thirst after it as shall make us run to it. These are the things which procure our sanctification, and with which it is

* Prateol. Elen. Heresic. lib. vii., cap. de Græcis. † Possevin. in Mosc. p. 43.

impossible but those that come to the communion must partake of Jesus Christ, and without which it is impossible they should.'* And a little further, endeavouring to prove that the souls separate from their bodies, do receive the same as the faithful which are living in this world, of the sacrament. 'If the soul,' says he, 'has no need of the body whereby to receive sanctification, but on the contrary the body has need of the soul, what more of the mystery do the souls receive which are clothed with their bodies, than those which are stripped of them? Is it that they behold the priest and receive the gifts from him? But the souls that are out of the body have the eternal priest, who is to them more than all these things, being the same, likewise, that administereth it to them alive, who receive it as they ought to do. For all those to whom the priests administer it, cannot be said truly to receive it. The priest administers it to all that come to him, but our Saviour gives it only to those that are worthy to partake of it; whence it clearly appears that it is our Saviour alone who, by means of this sacrament, consecrates and sanctifies the souls as well of the living as the dead.'

"Leo Allatius has made a catalogue of Simeon, the Abbot of St. Mamant's works, who lived about the end of the eleventh century, and whom the Greeks call 'Simeon the Divine.' Now, in one of his treatises, there is a hymn, expressly relating to this subject, before us, to wit, that the wicked do not partake of the body of Jesus Christ when they receive the sacrament. Allatius tells us that he has seen this particular piece (being a manuscript), in a certain library in Italy, and that the title of it is, 'That they which receive unworthily the sacraments do not receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ.' And it is unto this whereunto relates what Nilus says in his sentences, 'Keep yourselves from all corruption, and partake every day of the mystical supper, for it is after this sort that the body of Jesus Christ becomes ours.'† And what we find in the verse of Psellus on the canticle of canticles, Jesus Christ gives His body to the children of the Virgin; that is to say, to the Church; for thus does He speak to them (but it is only to those that are worthy), whom He calls His near kindred: 'come, my friends, eat and drink, and be merry, my brethren, you that are my brethren in good works, eat my body and drink my blood.'‡ And these words of Joanicius Cartanus, the saints are made partakers of holy things, not they that are unworthy, and sinners who having not cleansed themselves from their sins remain still polluted;' and elsewhere, 'when we shall

* Gabisil. in explicat. Litur. cap. 22.

† Apud. Allat. de Simeon Nil. in par. Bibl. Patr. Græco-Lat. tom. ii.

‡ Comm. trium. Patr. in Cant. Cant.

draw near unto God with love, fear, reverence, and repentance, and be in charity with all men, then shall we be meet partakers of the body and blood of Christ."*

The reasoning of Claude upon this is irresistible, as follows: "Now, if you would know of what importance the argument is, which we draw from this doctrine of the Greeks, you need but read what Chifflet, the Jesuit, and others, have written touching a passage of the confession attributed to Alcuinus, which bears, 'That the virtue of this sacrifice is so great, that it is the body and blood of Jesus Christ only to the just sinners; tanta est virtus hujus sacrificii ut solis Justis peccatoribus corpus sit et sanguis Christi.† If a sacrifice, or sacrament,' says this Jesuit, 'be the body and blood of Jesus Christ to some only, and not to all, what remains, then, but to confess that Alcuinus has been the forerunner of Berengarius and Calvin, and that he has denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist? He tells us, this passage has given him no small trouble, and endeavours to expound it, saying, that Alcuinus speaks of the body and blood of Christ in respect of their salutiferous effect which appertains only to the just. But the authors of the 'Office of the Blessed Sacrament' having told us, that it seems we must read, 'Tanta est virtus sacrificii ut solis justis, non peccatoribus sanguis sit et corpus Christi,' they have added, 'that this expression has not been used since the heresy of Berengarius, and that the schoolmen, who have been more scrupulous as to terms, have, after the rise of the heresies touching this mystery, avoided it.'‡ Which is as much as to say, in my opinion, that if we believe transubstantiation, as the Church of Rome has believed it since the time of Berengarius's condemnation, we cannot be of this belief, that the Eucharist is only the body of Jesus Christ to the faithful, and not to the wicked. And, in effect, if the substance of bread be really changed into that of Christ's body, it hence evidently follows that

* Apud Allat. de perpet. Cons. lib. iii.

† Chifflet præfat. ad Lector. in Confess. Alcu.

‡ In their historical and chronological table, under the title of B. Alcuin.

all those that communicate thereof, be they either righteous or wicked, do receive this body as it is; that is to say, in its proper substance, covered with the veil of accidents. So that the Greeks, asserting the Eucharist not to be the body of Christ to sinners (as I have already shewed), makes the proof I draw hence concerning their not believing of transubstantiation to be solid and convincing.

But it is further evident what the opinion of Cabasilas was as to *the thing* which was received in the Supper. For he reasons that the dead enjoy the fruition of the self-same eating as those who partake of the mysteries on earth.

"'The purity of the soul,' says he, 'the love of God, faith, an earnest desire to partake of this holy mystery, a secret joy which accompanies this desire, a fervent appetite and thirst which makes us run to it, these are the things which procure our sanctification, with which qualifications it is not possible but those that approach the communion do partake of Jesus Christ, and without which it is impossible they should. Now, all these things depend only on the soul, and are not corporeal. There is nothing, then, which hinders the souls of the dead from having these things as well as the living. If, then, these souls are in the state and disposition requisite for the receiving of the mystery, if he to whom it belongs to bestow sanctification and consecration is always willing to sanctify, and ever desires to communicate himself in all places, what can then hinder this participation?' And a little further: 'It is evident,' says he, 'by the things now mentioned, that whatsoever belongs to this mystery is common as well to the dead as living.' And a little lower: 'The participation of the holy gifts is a thing which necessarily attends the souls after death. If their joy and repose sprang from any other principle, it might be said that even this would be the reward of that purity wherein they are, and this table would be no longer needful to them. But it is certain that, whatsoever makes up their delights and felicity, whether you call it Paradise or Abraham's bosom, or those happy seats free from sorrow and cares, or that you call it the kingdom of heaven itself; all this, I say, is no more than this bread and wine. For these things are our mediator, who is entered as our forerunner into the holy places, who alone conducts us to the Father, who is the only Sun of our souls, which at this time appeareth and communicates Himself to all them that are in the bands of the flesh in the manner He Himself pleases, but He shall then visibly

manifest Himself without a veil, when we shall see Him as He is, and shall gather together the eagles about the dead body.' "

But this matter is carried still further by the same writer, for he shews elsewhere what kind of eating it is he means, and that it can be no other than *spiritual.* It is true he does not attempt to fix the *modus operandi;* for, when speaking of the dead, he asks, "Are they in a worse condition in this respect than the living? No, sure; for our Saviour communicates Himself to them in such a manner as is best known to Himself." He afterwards inquires into the causes of the sanctification of the living and their participation of Jesus Christ, and says: "It is not to have a body, nor to come with feet to the holy table, nor to receive the communion with our hand and mouth, nor to eat or drink, but that it is the purity of the soul, faith, love of God, and other motives of piety, these are the things which make us necessarily partakers of Jesus Christ, and without which it is not possible to be so."

This appears by the sequel of his reasoning; and what he says concerning the dead, the same he says concerning the living which dwell in deserts, and that cannot personally come to the Lord's table. "Jesus Christ," says he, "sanctifies them invisibly with this sanctification. How can we know this? I answer, because they have the life in themselves, and they would not have it were they not partakers of this mystery. For our Saviour Himself has said, 'Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, you have no life in you.' And for a further confirmation of this, He has caused to be brought to several of these saints the gifts by the ministry of angels." It is evident he attributes to these inhabitants of deserts the same participation of Jesus Christ, the same manducation of His flesh and blood which we receive in the sacrament without the least difference; whence it follows that our communion with Jesus Christ, by means of the sacrament, is purely spiritual, and that our eating of His flesh is spiritual likewise, there being no need of adding the reception of His substance into our stomachs.

But yet this does more plainly appear by what follows. "The

gift," says he, "is indeed communicated to the living by means of the body, but it first passes to the substance of the soul, and afterwards communicates itself to the body by the ministry of the soul. Which St. Paul meant when he said, that he that is joined to the Lord, is one and the same spirit with Him, because this union and conjunction is made first of all in the soul. This being the seat of this sanctification, which we obtain by the exercise of our virtues. This is likewise the seat of sin. It is here wherein is the band of servitude, by which the sacrament links us to God. The body has nothing but what it derives from the soul, and as its pollutions proceed from the evil thoughts of the heart, from the heart, likewise, comes its sanctification, as well that of the virtues as that of the mysteries. If, then, the soul has no need of the body to receive sanctification, but the body, on the contrary, of the soul, why, then, must the souls, which are yet clothed with their bodies, be greater partakers of the mystery than those stripped of them?"

The reflections and conclusions of Mons. Claude, from all this, are most just and pertinent. "We must be strangely prepossessed with prejudice, if we do not acknowledge that this author only establishes the sanctifying and spiritual communion, and not that of the proper substance of the body and blood of our Saviour; for if we suppose the bread to be the body of Jesus Christ in sanctification and virtue, it is easy to comprehend what he means; but if we suppose transubstantiation, how shall we then understand what he says—viz., that the gift is indeed received by the body, but it immediately passes to the soul, and afterwards communicates itself from the soul to the body? Does not the substance of the body of Jesus Christ descend immediately from the mouth into the stomach, and does it not remain there till the change of the species? How, then, shall we understand Him when He says, that our communion with Jesus Christ is first established in the soul? For it is certain, that to judge of it in the sense of transubstantiation, it would be established, on the contrary, first of all in the body, which would be the first subject that would receive

the substance of the flesh and blood of our Lord. How shall we understand the conclusion he draws from all this discourse; to wit, that the souls of the dead are no less partakers of this mystery than those of the living, for the living do communicate after two manners, spiritually and substantially, whereas the dead only in one? How, in fine, shall we understand what he means in saying, that the body has no other sanctification, by means of the mystery, than that which comes to it from the soul? Is it nowise sanctified by touching the proper substance of the Son of God." I shall pretend to add nothing to this; for aught more condemnatory of Rome's peculiar dogmas of the corporeal presence it would be impossible to find.

But one of the most necessary consequences of transubstantiation is the adoration of the sacrament. We have already seen that a strong proof of the ignorance of the ancient Church, is the absence of all intimation of, and direction for, the adoration of the host. But this same defect is apparent in the ritual of the modern Greek Church. In the midst of much superstition, as has been already shewn, and in prostrations of an almost idolatrous nature before the unconsecrated bread and wine, there is yet an entire absence of any prescribed worship of the elements after consecration. This is wholly unaccountable on the idea of belief in transubstantiation. But, in fact, we have the strongest of all evidence on the subject,—the protestations of the Greeks themselves, and the confessions of their Popish adversaries. What stronger proofs could we have on any subject? It has been already shewn, that to the elements before consecration so much external respect is paid, as would lay the Greeks open to the charge of idolatry, if it were given after consecration. Now, this shews most clearly that the modern Greeks recognise the same distinction as did the ancients between δουλεία and λατρία. The following passages will put this matter beyond the possibility of dispute:

Stephen Stylite vindicates himself from the charge of idolatry by the following reasoning, which, while we cannot acknowledge

its validity as a proof of the propriety of image worship, is unquestionable evidence against the adoration of the Eucharist with supreme worship. Stephen writes as follows:

"What crime do we commit, when we represent, by an image, the human shape of Jesus Christ, who has been seen, and whom we worship? Is this to adore a creature, or do you think it may be truly said that we adore the matter, when we adore a cross, be it made of what stuff it will? We adore the holy vestments and sacred vessels, without incurring any censure, for we are persuaded that by prayer they are changed into holy things. Will you banish, likewise, from the Church, the antitypes of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, because they are the image and true figure of this body and blood? We worship and kiss them, and by partaking of them obtain sanctification."*

Damascene, also, who lived about the same time as Stephen, and stiffly maintained the same cause, thus argues:

"I worship not," says he, "the matter, but the author of the matter, who has Himself become matter for my sake, and exists in it, to the end He may give me salvation by it; and, as to the matter by which salvation is procured me, I will ever worship it, not as the Divinity—God forbid—for how can that be God which has been taken out of nothing? although it be true that the body of God is God by means of the union of the two natures in unity of person, for the body is made without conversion that which it hath been anointed, and remains what it was by nature, to wit, living flesh, endued with a reasonable soul and understanding, which has had a beginning, and been created. As to the other matter, by which salvation has been obtained for us, I honour and worship it, as being full of the divine grace. The blessed wood of the cross, is it not matter? The holy and venerable Mount Calvary, is it not matter? The Rock of Life, wherein was the sepulchre of Jesus Christ, and which was the spring of our resurrection, was it not matter? Those black letters wherewith the holy Gospels were written, are they not matter? This holy table, from whence we receive the bread of life, is it not matter? In fine, the body and blood of our Lord, are they not matter? You must either, then, overthrow the veneration and worship of all these things, or grant the adoration of the images of God, and His friends the saints."†

* Vita S. Stephani junioris apud Damascen. Biblii. † Orat. i. de Imag.

How different is the language of the same man, when arguing for the adoration of the divine persons in the Trinity:

"I adore," says he, "one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; I give to Him alone the worship of Latria; I worship one God, one Divinity; but I adore likewise the Trinity of persons, God the Father, God the Son, clothed with human flesh, and God the Holy Ghost, which yet are no more than one God. I worship not the creature besides the Creator, but I adore the Creator who hath made me, and who, without the loss of His dignity, or suffering any division, has descended to me to honour my nature, and make me partaker of the divine nature. I do also, together with my God and King, adore the enclosure of His body, if a man may so express himself, though not as a vestment, or fourth person, God forbid, but as having been declared God, and made without conversion, that which it hath been anointed. If you say," says he, in another place a little farther, "that we ought only to be joined with God in spirit and understanding; abolish, then, all corporeal things, tapers, incense, prayers uttered with an articulate voice; nay, even the divine mysteries, which consist of matter, to wit, the bread and wine, the oil of unction, the sign of the cross, the reed, and lance, which pierced His side, to make life issue out from thence. Either the veneration of all these things must be abolished, which cannot be done, or not reject the worship of images."*

Thus, to what he calls indifferently "bread and wine," "the body and blood of Christ," he assigns but a subordinate, though, it must be acknowledged, superstitious amount of reverence, as to the other things mentioned. It is impossible to prove anything like the adoration of the host from such passages as these.

But the advocates of the Church of Rome candidly acknowledge this *defect* in the religious worship of the Greeks. Claude quotes the following testimonies, which I have not the means of verifying.† Sacranus, canon of Cracow, when reckoning up the errors of the Muscovites, who, it is well known, belong to the Greek Church, says: "Before the cup is prepared, they light torches, and expose to the people's sight, with exceeding great devotion, the bread, which is to be consecrated, with the wine and hot water, which they pour into the chalice. They carry these

* Orat. i. de Imag. † Cath. Doct. bk. iii. cap. 7.

about, and the people bow down before them with the greatest testimonies of respect and veneration. But afterwards, when the bread is placed on the altar, and consecrated, there is no veneration shewed it, nor do they make any elevation of it."*

John de Lasko, archbishop of Gnesne, and ambassador from Poland to Rome in the beginning of the sixteenth century, makes exactly the same charges as does Sacranus. But Peter Scarga, a Jesuit, in a book which he has written against the Greeks, *de uno pastore*, charges them that "At mass they worship on their knees the bread before it is consecrated; but after its consecration they give no honour to the most holy body of Jesus Christ."

But Antony Caucus, who, at the command of Pope Gregory XIII., enquired particularly into the same matter, testifies of the Greeks:

"They yield no reverence, honour, veneration, nor worship to the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist consecrated with leavened bread, according to their custom, they carry it to the sick without lights and torches. They keep it in their churches in a bag hanging against a wall in a little wooden box, and yet burn tapers before the images of all the saints."

And when he sets himself to the opposing of this error, he thus writes:

"There is no people (that I know of) who profess the Christian religion that shew less respect and veneration to the holy sacrament, than the Greek nation. They adore and reverence their leavened bread before it is consecrated, even to the very idolising of it, but after scarcely rise up to respect it. Their priests carry the Eucharist in their bosoms to the sick, without any lights, and that which is most absurd is, they keep it in their churches in a little wooden box, tied up in a bag, and hanged against a wall without any lights before it, as if it were a profane thing to the scandalising of all pious people. I believe they have this custom from the heretical sacramentaries, who deny the virtue of this most holy sacrament. They are, moreover, so superstitious and covetous, that when deceased persons have bequeathed them any legacy, they light candles before the images of all the saints, drawing near to them with the greatest testimonies of reverence when

* Religio. Ruthenor. art. 20.

they enter the churches, but they turn their backs to the holy sacrament of the Eucharist. I wondered to see them do thus, and, being desirous to inform myself of the reason of this irreverence, shewing them how grievously they erred, in that they testified a greater respect to the saints who are the servants and friends of our Saviour than to Himself, who is their Lord and Master. These Fathers gave me no other answer but that there was no command which enjoined this respect and adoration. This answer is heretical, as I shall hereafter manifest; for John Oecolampadus (that arch-heretic of our time, the ringleader of the sacramentaries, asserted that our Saviour was not contained in the sacrament of the Eucharist) has, likewise, written, and publicly taught, that we ought in no wise to adore the Eucharist with an adoration of Latria, terming all them idolaters that did so."

I shall conclude this chapter with some very express testimonies from the pens of modern Greeks, which give their belief in their own words. These, it will be remembered, are of more value than anything which can be found now on either side of the controversy. It will be seen, by this testimony, that the doctrine of a substantial change of the elements was not known to the Greek Church in the ages immediately following the Reformation.

Christopher Angelus, a Greek, who, in the sixteenth century, suffered much from the Turks, and at length came to England, where he died, gives the following statement in his account of the Greek Church: "The priest," says he, "carrying in his hands the holy things, draws near to the people, and stops at the door of the sanctuary, where at once he distributes to every one the body and blood of our Lord; that is to say, bread and wine mixed, saying, this servant of God receives, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the remission of his sins. Amen."*

Metrophanus Critopulus, patriarch of Alexandria, in reply to the question as to whether or not Christ is corporeally present in the Eucharist, answers:

"We call the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, but a sacrifice that is spiritual and commemorative; spiritual, as having nothing of carnal in

* Status et ritus Ecclesiæ Græcæ à Christoph Angelo. cap. xxiii.

it, according to that of our Saviour, the words which I speak to you are spirit and life. Commemorative, as being performed in remembrance of the sacrifice once offered on the cross, according to that other expression of our Saviour, do this in remembrance of me; which is what is taught by St. Chrysostom, and the whole Church, saying, this is done in remembrance of what was done then; do this, says our Saviour, in remembrance of me. We offer not any other sacrifice, as did heretofore the high priest, under the Old Testament, but we offer ever day the same, or, to speak better, we commemorate this sacrifice. But we never believed Christ was bodily present in the mystery."

Meletius, metropolitan of Ephesus, when asked by the divines of Leyden, "Whether we may pray to angels, or the Virgin Mary, and religiously worship them, and whether we must believe the bread to be transubstantiated in the sacrament, *Ἀποφαίνομαι λέγων ὅτι ὄυδεν τοιούτων κατέχειν προσήκει, ὃυ τὲ μην δόγματα ἐξεστί μοι δοξάζειν ἀνθρώπινα, πλην τὰ παρὰ κυρίου ἡ τῶν ἀυτοῦ μαθητῶν*; answers, I declare there are none of these things to be believed, for I may not believe the doctrines of men before those of Christ and His apostles."

Another very important document is given by Mr. Claude: "It is a declaration of the sense of the Greek Church, drawn up by a Greek doctor, named Jeremias. It says, 'The different use of the mystery of the Eucharist has produced different sentiments, some celebrating it with unleavened bread, others with that which is leavened and kneaded, some believing it to be only a sign, others that the bread is changed and altered by the Word. Those that believe the change are the western people, which administer this sacrament according to the doctrine of the Roman Church, and all the rest hold the sign except the eastern people; for the Eastern Church differs from both these, and yet teaches a doctrine that is easy, full of piety, and free from contradiction. She affirms, then, that the bishop, or priest, in the divine service, holds the place of Christ, making the propitiation for the sins of the people, and that, by the holy invocation of God's name, and mention of the divine words of our Saviour, the spiritual grace descends that sanctifies the bread and wine, and changes them,

not into the sensible, but spiritual, body of Jesus Christ. And as to those that assert the substance of bread and wine is changed into the natural flesh of Jesus Christ, if they understand hereby a supernatural change after a spiritual manner, those that do thus speak, concur in their opinion with the Eastern Church. But seeing they will have this to be sensibly effected, our Church does therein disagree with them, although they have recourse to another way of speaking, in telling us of accidents and species, and such like things, which none of the ancients ever thought of, much less mentioned.

And, lastly, I shall quote from the confession of faith of Cyrillus Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, whose interesting history will be found in Claude (bk. iii. c. 12). On the subject of our inquiry, this confession runs thus :

"We believe that the second sacrament, which the Lord has instituted, is that which we call the Eucharist, for in the night in which He was betrayed, taking bread and blessing it, He said to His apostles, 'Take, eat, this is my body;' and, taking the cup, He gave thanks, and said, 'Drink ye all of this; this is my blood, which is shed for you; do this in remembrance of me.' And St. Paul adds: 'As often as ye shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shew the Lord's death.' This is the plain, true, and lawful tradition, of this admirable mystery, in the administration and understanding of which, we confess and believe a real and certain presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, to wit, that which faith offers and gives us, and not that which transubstantiation has rashly invented and teaches. For we believe the faithful eat the body of Jesus Christ in the sacrament, not in a sensible chewing of Him with the teeth, in the communion, but in communicating by the sense of the soul. For our Lord's body is not in the mystery, what our eyes behold, and what we take, but that which faith (which receives after a spiritual manner) presents and gives us. Wherefore, it is certain, if we believe we eat and participate; but if we believe not, we are deprived of this benefit."

It was my intention to have gone at some length into the history of the Syrian Church in Malabar,—and to shew that, before Xavier's missionary visit to India, in the sixteenth century, and

the subsequent crusade for the establishment of Popery by fraud and force under Menizes, the Pope's archbishop of Goa, that ancient Church was comparatively free from Romish error,—but the intention must be abandoned. To any one wishing to become acquainted with the evidences of this fact, I would mention the "History of Christianity in India," by the Rev. J. Hough, where will be found an account of the proceedings of each of the above personages, in seeking to effect the object of their voluntary expatriation. To the same work are added, as an appendix, the decrees of the Synod of Diamper, in the year 1599, which, in numberless instances, and in the plainest language, acknowledge all we assert. I will give but one decree of the many bearing upon our subject, from which may be at once seen the anti-Romish character of the ancient Syrian Church. The decree is on "Masses for the Dead," and runs as follows:

"Whereas there is nothing that is so great a help to the souls of the faithful that are in the fire of purgatory as the holy sacrifice of the mass, *of which there is no memory remaining in this diocese;* that holy sacrifice having been instituted for the health and remedy of the living and of the dead: wherefore the synod doth exhort all the faithful of this bishopric to accustom themselves to procure masses to be said for the souls of their deceased friends, and to leave something by will that they may have masses said for their own souls, which will be much more profitable for them than the feasts that they used to make for their kindred and others invited to their funerals; which custom shall be left off, and instead thereof they shall give a dole to the poor, which is also very profitable to the souls of the departed. And that the decree relating to such masses may have its due effect, the synod doth command, that all that shall be found to have died worth two thousand fanams, and have left nothing for a certain number of masses to be said for their souls, shall have so much taken out of their estates before they shall be divided among the heirs, as shall procure the saying of five masses for their souls, which shall be deposited by the executors in the hands of the churchwardens,

by them to be distributed among five priests, that they may be the sooner said; and, where there are more than five priests, the alms shall be given to the five eldest, there not being sufficient to divide among them all; and where there is only the vicar of the Church, the whole shall be given to him: which custom of procuring masses to be said for the souls of the faithful departed this life, as it is used in the universal Church, so it is what this synod is extremely desirous to introduce into this bishopric, *wherein it has been totally disused*, recommending this matter earnestly to the preachers and confessors, to persuade all Christians to it in their sermons and confessions, and to the vicars to do the same in their admonitions."

No plainer confession could be needed of the novelty of masses in the Malabar Church, which there, as elsewhere, the emissaries of the Pope were "extremely desirous of introducing." The same acknowledgment of innovation is frequently made in these decrees, and really shew, more plainly than anything else at the present hour, the onslaught which was made, by the wily and unscrupulous Menizes, on the doctrine of these Syrian Christians. Records we might have had, doubtless, in abundance, but for the destruction (demanded by the decrees of the same council) of all the ancient Syrian books of theology. But it was not enough to burn the books of these ancient Christians, but their bodies were also committed to the flames. The dreadful atrocities of the "Inquisition of Goa," which the Synod of Diamper decreed supreme over that branch of the Indian Church, are well known, and shew the permanency of character of the Romish Church for craft and cruelty, in obliterating the ancient creed of Christians, antecedently independent of her jurisdiction, and in silencing the voice of opponents by the sure conviction of the dungeon, the rack, and the faggot. Rome is the double tyrant of both the body and the soul; and in both worlds—the present and the future. We must, however, cease to wonder at her pretensions among men, when we recollect that her predicted character is, that she seeks to lord it over even the Deity Himself (2 *Thess.* ii., 4).

CONCLUSION.

Thus have I, certainly at greater length than was at first contemplated, considered the *true* doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as it meets us in the inspired records of its original institution, and also in the notices of a similar character which we find regarding it in the writings of the apostles. The import of our Redeemer's words, and the sense in which they were understood in every century, have been fully considered; and it is found that the claim to establish the modern Romish doctrine upon anything in antiquity is deceptive, if not baseless. The argument, both positive and negative, is fatal to such a pretence; for the most that can be brought in support of transubstantiation from antiquity is, the warm expressions of the early Church, which apply the name of the thing signified to the thing signifying. Beyond this, there is literally *no* ground whatever to support such a claim, but every imaginable argument against it. Whether we regard the absence of objections respecting this doctrine by the heathen, or the omission of all directions in the ancient liturgies for worship, and the other consequences of the corporeal presence,—whether we consider the simultaneous rise of both objections on the one hand, and rubrical directions on the other, when, in later times, the tenet concerned was insisted upon, or the qualifying and limiting phrases of the Fathers themselves, or still more the unanimous protestations of the whole anti-Romish world since the Reformation, as to the doctrine and its consequences,—I think we must equally arrive at the conclusion, that transubstantiation was not taught in the ancient Church, but is a doctrine of modern growth. It seemed necessary, in seeking to establish the true doctrine, first

to dislodge the false; having done which, I have endeavoured to exhibit the sound view of the most solemn of religious ordinances, in the very words used by the various churches of Protestant Christendom. I believe these are, as nearly as possible, consentaneous with each other, and with the infallible word of God.

The object which Dr. Waterland had in view when he wrote his valuable treatise, still claims attention; for there is a large class of persons, generally *outside* the Church of England, which sinks the estimate of sacramental ordinances into that of *bare* memorials, or, at best, significant rites, considering them as *only* physical representations of invisible things or operations. The existence of such opinions will always make the treatise of Waterland valuable to the Church; and, in the *true* doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, I could hardly pass them by without notice, though it was not my *first* object to combat them. The concluding words of the author referred to shall be mine in reference to this branch of the subject:—"What I have endeavoured all the way, has been to maintain the dignity of a venerable sacrament, by the light of reason, Scripture, and antiquity, against unreasonable attempts to depreciate or undervalue it. The common methods of subversion begin with lessening the work of preparation, and then go on to sink the benefits; the next step in the progress is to reduce the whole to a bare memorial, a memorial of an absent friend, master, or chief martyr: passing over the divine perfections of our Lord, and the all-sufficient merits of what he has done and suffered for us. Now, in order to build up again, as others pull down, the business of these papers has been to shew, that the sacramental memorial is a memorial of Christ God-man, who died a willing sacrifice for the sins of mankind; and that it is not a bare memorial, or representation of something once done and suffered, but a real and present exhibition of the graces, comforts, or blessings accruing therefrom, to every worthy receiver; that, therefore, proper acknowledgments and engagements are expected from us, and those require suitable preparations and qualifications, and a deportment thereto corresponding; in a word, self-examination and self-approbation

beforehand, serious resolutions of amendment at the time, and a conscientious care afterwards, to persevere in well-doing to our lives' end."

But while these *low* views have now in great measure lost their *direct* influence, it is not to be supposed that they are powerless, and wholly unconnected with the directly opposite view, which would make the sacraments *charms*, and invest them with a superstitious and even magical influence. The low views which have prevailed are constantly assigned as the grounds why other, even the Popish, should now be propagated. *Extremes* not only *meet*, but even *beget each other*. The oscillation of the pendulum to the left is what gives it its power for a like oscillation to the right. Minds of a less devout, though not necessarily of an undevout character, embrace the low or Socinian view; while the devotional, but ill-informed or ill-regulated, run to the superstitious. These mutually repel at one point, but attract at another; and the close connection between the two states is seen in this, that when either class changes, it does not halt at the middle and safe point between, but runs across to the opposite. *Medio tutissimus* is the wise motto well adhered to in the Church of England.

It is no necessary part of my undertaking to shew the devotional bearing of this important question. The *true* doctrine must undoubtedly be influential on practice, and aids may be very useful both for preparation and in participation; but these already exist, numerous and good. I can only hope that such as may peruse what I have written or collated, may by it be grounded in their most holy faith, and feel greater confidence not only in protesting against the errors of Rome, but in the substantive belief of the doctrines of their own Church. It appears to me that no one can rise from a sifting examination of this important subject, without an ejaculation of heartfelt praise to God for the wonderful providences which secured to us the Blessed Reformation.

END OF BOOK II.

APPENDIX.

PREFACE.

The history of this Tract is curious, from the varied treatment it has met with at the hands of the Romanists, as well as the influence it has exercised in our own Church.

It was undoubtedly written in the middle of the ninth century at the request of Charles the Bald, who reigned from the year 840 to 877, to oppose the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which Paschasius about that time first propounded. Its author has gone under several names, Ratramn, Intramn, and Bertram.*

The learned Cave, in his Historia Litteraria,† thus sums up the fate of this Tract: "All who have taken their first lessons in Theology know, how plainly, how learnedly he treateth the subject of the Eucharist in his book concerning the Body and Blood of Christ, and how clearly he rejecteth the dogma of Transubstantiation as it is explained in the Romish Schools. Wherefore the Papists from their desire to banish this tract to Anticyra, or rather to Orcus itself, (for it has been stamped with the black mark of condemnation by the Censors of Trent, and Louvain, by Sixtus Senensis, Bellarmine, Genebrard, Possevin, Gregory of Valentia, Gretzer, &c.) have attacked it with every instrument of hostility. Some endeavour to diminish the Author's reputation; others calumniate him as a heretic, desirous of change, as a monk kicking against his superiors. The staid manners of the man, and his fame untouched through so many ages, clearly refute this. Others loudly exclaim, that his work is corrupt and interpolated. Against this, the faith of so many ancient Manuscripts must be taken, and that of the Easter Homily by our own Ælfric, who flourished in the year 960, which is borrowed almost word for word from the tract of Ratramn. Lastly, others would prove that John Erigena, and not Ratramn, is its author. What then? As if John Scotus were not his equal, both in age and learning. But in truth, the candid confession of John Mabillon easily convicteth this party; for he confesseth, that he found the name of

* Moreri. Diction. Hist. tom. ix. † P. 530, ed. 1688.

Ratramn* at the beginning of an ancient Manuscript 800 years old, in the monastery of Lobez. Indeed, Antony Sanders made mention of this Manuscript long before in his Catalogue of the Belgian Libraries, part i. p. 303. And in very truth, men, in other respects grave and learned, work wondrous hard at trifles, when they undertake to prove, that Ratramn in this Tract favours the doctrine of the Romish Church, or, at least, does not oppose it; from which, nevertheless, it is as far distant as the East is from the West. What can they produce worthy of so huge a promise? Let these new champions of Transubstantiation, as far as I am concerned, go on with it; let them transform Ratramn into Paschasius himself for I would as soon believe them to be one and the same person, as that Ratramn held on this point the same doctrine with Paschasius, and the Romish Church of the present day."

Bellarmine against all authority, and without a shadow of proof, asserts that Ratramn was the innovator, and Paschasius the defender of the Catholic doctrine, when the fact is the very reverse.† In his account of Ecclesiastical writers,‡ he only makes incidental mention of Ratramn under the head "Paschasius," in these words: "He [Paschasius] was the first author who wrote in a copious and systematic way on the truth of the Lord's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, against Bertram, who first brought it into doubt."

The Tract is now universally admitted to have been written by Ratramn, and in answer to Paschasius. The question then remains, whether he is to be considered as holding or denying the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Here the Romanists themselves are divided; at one time condemning him, at another time claiming him as making with them. Bellarmine's opinion is clear from his own words above quoted. The Tract also stands in the Index of prohibited books, made by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1559, and is retained in most of the succeeding Indices. One published at Strasbourg, A.D. 1609, has a curious judgment given by the University of Douay, and approved by the Censors. This Index is a reprint of a former Edition of 1571; from which Bishop Ridley's Biographer, in his account of Ratramn's Tract, gives the following version of the passage.§ "Although we care not greatly for this book of Bertram's, whether it be extant or no, yet because it is often printed, and read of many, and the heretics know by a catalogue of forbidden books that he was a Catholic Priest, and dear unto Charles the Great (*i.e.* the Bald), and because we comment upon other writers of the same age, and extenuate their errors oftentimes by a favour-

* This shews Ratramn was his real name.

† See Dupin Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiast. Siecle xi.

‡ P. 276. ed. Colon. 1613. § Ridley's Life of Ridley, p. 172.

able construction of them, by the same reason we may allow Bertram, and acknowledge him; for their is nothing worthy of reprehension in him, setting aside a little obscurity in his style, and his ignorance in using some dark words and sentences, which, with marginal notes affixed, may manifest the true sense and meaning of the Author."

Of this principle we find such instances as these; "invisible" is substituted for "visible," and "substance" explained by "accidents."

After the genuineness of the Tract was put beyond all doubt by the discovery of the Manuscripts, M. Boileau, doctor of the Sorbonne, published an exact transcript of the Lobez Manuscript, and at the same time in an excessively loose French translation, "has made," as Dr. Hopkins says, "not so much a translation as a conversion of Bertram." In the Appendix to the Edition of 1688, Dr. Hopkins fully exposes Dr. Boileau's artifices. Whether Ratramn will bear the sense there put upon him may be seen from Cave's opinion above quoted, and the use which has been made of this Tract in our own Church, both before her infection with Romish errors, and at the time she freed herself from them.

In the Appendix we have reprinted from Lisle Collection of Saxon Treatises, with one exception, mentioned page 63, the Saxon Homily of Ælfric, Abbot of St. Alban's and also of Malmesbury, who flourished about the year 960. Its agreement with the tract of Ratramn is not only doctrinal, but very often verbal, as will be seen by comparing the sections of Ratramn to which we have referred. It was set forth, together with the two Epistles of Ælfric, by Abp. Parker, with his own subscription, that of the Abp. of York and thirteen Bishops, under the title of "*A Testimony of Antiquity, shewing the Ancient Faith of the Church of England, touching the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, here publicly preached, and also received in the Saxons time, above* 700 *years ago.*" This Sermon was appointed in the reign of the Saxons to be pronounced to the people before they should receive the Communion on Easter Day.*

To come to later times. This tract of Ratramn seems to have formed a link in the history of the English Church, connecting us as well at the Reformation, as in Saxon times, with the views of Primitive Antiquity.

The Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation was retained in our Church as embodied in the Mass book throughout the reign of Henry the VIII. Bp. Ridley was one of the first of our divines who returned to a sounder judgment on this point of doctrine. He passed the year 1545 in retirement at his vicarage of Hearne, whither he carried with him this Tract of Ratramn. He then first saw the unsoundness of the Romish Doctrine

* See Strype, Parker, vol. i. p. 472.

of Transubstantiation, without falling into the low views of the foreign reformers.* This change of opinion he communicated to Abp. Cranmer about 1546; whereupon they both set to examine the subject with more than ordinary care,† and the primitive and Catholic doctrine was accordingly embodied in the first reformed Communion Service of 1549.

Bp. Ridley himself thus acknowledged his debt to Ratramn before the Commissioners at Oxford, A.D. 1555.

"Here I would beg you, Reverend Sirs, you Mr. Prolocutor, and you the other Commissioners, deign to understand that I do rest not only on those things which heretofore I have written in my former responsions and confirmations, but that I have also for confirmation of my opinion whatever Bertram hath writ, a man learned and orthodox, and ever accounted Catholic for these 700 years until this our age. His Tract, whoever will read and weigh, considering the age of the writer, his learning, godliness, allegations of ancient Fathers, and his manifold and weighty arguments, I cannot but very much marvel, how he can with a good conscience, if he fear God, speak against him in this matter of the Eucharist. This man was the first that pulled me by the ear, and forced me from the common error of the Roman Church, to a more diligent search of Scripture and Ecclesiastical writers on this matter; and these things I speak before God, Who knoweth that I lie not in what I say.‡

There are two old English translations in the Bodleian, with the dates 1548 and 1549. There was a translation made in 1623 by Sir Humphrey Lynde, and reprinted in 1686. Dr. Hopkins, Canon of Worcester, published two editions of the text, with an English translation; the first in 1686, the latter in 1688, after Dr. Boileau's edition had appeared, with the Appendix before referred to.

Our first intention was merely to revise the translation of Dr. Hopkins; but as the work advanced, it seemed necessary to re-translate the Tract entirely.

H. W.
W. C. C.

* Ridley's Life of Ridley, pp. 163, 165. † See Strype, Cranmer, 368.
‡ The original is given in Ridley's life of Ridley, App. p. 685.

HERE BEGINNETH

THE BOOK OF RATRAMN

ON THE

BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD.

I.—You have bidden me, O glorious Prince, to make known to your Majesty, what I think touching the mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ. A command no less worthy of your magnificent and princely estate, than difficult for my poor ability. For what can be more worthy of a Prince, than to take care that he himself be Catholic in his judgment, concerning the sacred mysteries of Him, Who hath deigned to commit to him his kingly throne, and to endure not that his subjects should think diversely concerning the Body of Christ, in the which it is certain that the whole sum of Christian redemption doth consist?

Differences touching Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist.

II.—For whilst some of the faithful say, that the mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ, which is daily celebrated in the Church, is performed under no figure, or veil, but with the naked exhibition of the Truth itself; others testify, that these things are contained under the figure of a mystery, and that it is one thing, which appeareth to the bodily senses, and another, upon which faith gazeth. There is then clearly no small diversity of judgment among them. And though the Apostle writeth to the faithful, "that they should all think and speak the same thing, and that there should be no schism among them;" yet by no small schism are they divided, who give utterance to such diverse opinions touching the mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ.

1 *Cor.* i., 10.

Ratramn consulted.

III.—Wherefore your Royal Highness, being provoked with zeal for the faith, and with no easy mind pondering on these things, and

being desirous that, as the Apostle commandeth, "all men should think and speak the same thing," doth diligently search into this secret verity, that so you may recall to it them that are out of the way. Wherefore you do not disdain to ask the truth in this matter even from the most humble; for you well know that so great and secret a mystery cannot be acknowledged unless God reveal it, Who without respect of persons sheweth forth the light of His truth by whomsoever He chooseth.

IV.—Pleasant as it is to me to obey your command, yet no less difficult is it with my slender ability to dispute on a subject so far removed from human senses, and into which no one can penetrate except by the teaching of the Holy Ghost. Wherefore, in submission to your Majesty's command, yet with entire confidence in His aid, of Whom I am about to treat, I will strive to open what I think on this matter, in what words I can, not leaning to my own wit, but following the steps of the Holy Fathers.

State of the controversy in two questions.

V.—Your excellent Majesty inquireth, whether the Body and Blood of Christ, which in the Church is taken by the mouth of the faithful, be made so in a mystery or in truth; that is, whether it containeth any hidden thing, which lieth open to the eye of faith alone; or whether without the veil of any mystery, the sight gazeth on that Body outwardly, which the eye of the soul inwardly beholdeth, so that the whole matter standeth forth open and manifest. And, whether it be the very same Body which was born of Mary, suffered, died, and was buried, which rose again, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father.

The first question discussed.

VI.—Let us look closely into the first of these two questions, and let us define what *Figure* is, and what *Truth*, that we be not hindered by doubtful ambiguity, but that, keeping somewhat certain before our eyes, we may know whither we ought to direct the course of our reasoning.

Figure defined.

VII.—*Figure* is a certain outshadowing, which exhibiteth what it meaneth under some sort of veil; for instance, when we would speak of the Word, we say Bread; as in the Lord's Prayer, we pray that God would give us our daily Bread. Or as Christ in the Gospel saith, "I am the living Bread, Which came down from heaven." Or when He calleth Himself Vine, and His disciples the Branches; saying

Mat. vi., 11.

John vi., 51.

"I am the True Vine, and ye are the Branches." All these passages express one thing, and hint at another. *John* xv., 5.

VIII.—But *Truth* is the shewing forth of a plain matter, veiled under no shadowy images, but conveyed to us in clear, open, and (to speak more plainly yet) natural significations; as when we say that Christ was born of the Virgin, suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried. Nothing is here shadowed forth under the veil of figure, but the truth of the matter is exhibited in the natural signification of the words; nor must aught else be understood than is expressed. But in the former instances it is not so. For substantially Christ is not Bread, nor is Christ a Vine, nor are the Apostles Branches. So that in this case a *Figure* is presented in the expression, but in the former *Truth*, that is, the naked and open signification. Truth defined.

IX.—Now let us return to the subject, with a view to which this hath been said, namely, the Body and Blood of Christ. For if that mystery be performed under no figure, then it is not rightly called a mystery, since that cannot be called a mystery, in which there is nothing hid, nothing removed from our bodily senses, nothing concealed under any veil. But that bread, which by the ministry of the Priest is made the Body of Christ, sheweth one thing outwardly to man's senses, and proclaimeth another thing inwardly to the souls of the faithful. Outwardly, the form of bread, which it was before, is presented, its colour is exhibited, its taste is perceived; but inwardly, a far different thing is signified; and that much more precious, much more excellent, for it is heavenly, for it is divine; that is, Christ's Body is shewn forth, which is beheld, is taken, is eaten, not by the bodily senses, but by the gaze of the believing soul. This Sacrament proved to be in figure from the notion of mystery.

X.—Likewise the wine, which by the Priest's consecration is made the Sacrament of Christ's Blood, sheweth one thing outwardly, and inwardly containeth another. For what outwardly appeareth but the substance of wine? Taste it, there is the savour of wine: smell it, there is the scent of wine: behold it, there is the colour of wine. But if thou dost consider it inwardly, then it is no longer the liquor of wine, but the liquor of the Blood of Christ, that to the souls of believers savoureth when tasted, is recognized when beheld, is approved when smelt. Since no one can deny that this is so, it is plain, that that Bread and Wine are in a figure the Body and Blood of Christ. As to

outward appearance, neither the nature of flesh is recognized in that Bread, nor the fluid of blood in that Wine; yet after the mystic consecration, they are no longer called bread or wine, but Christ's Body and Blood.

Argument from the nature of faith.

XI.—If nothing is here taken in figure, as some say, but all is seen in truth, then faith hath no operation here; since [in that case] nought is performed spiritually, but the whole, whatever it be, is received altogether corporally. In that faith, according to the Apostle, *Heb.* xi., 1. is "the evidence of things not seen," that is, not of visible but of invisible substances, we shall [on their view] receive nothing according to faith, since thus, we pass judgment on it, whatever it be, by our bodily senses. And nothing is more absurd than to take mere bread for flesh, and to call mere wine blood. Nor will that be any longer a mystery, in which nothing secret, nothing hidden, is contained.

There must be a spiritual, for there is no natural change wrought in the elements.

XII.—And how shall that be called the Body of Christ, where no change is perceived to be made? For every change is either from not being to being, or from being to not being, or from one being to another. But in this Sacrament, if it be considered simply and in truth*, and naught else be believed than what is seen, we know of no change at all being made. For it hath not passed from not being to being, which passage holdeth in things produced, where the things had no former existence, but have, in order to their production, passed from not being into being. But here the bread and wine had a real existence, before they passed into the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. Nor is there any passage from being to not being, which passage holdeth in things which undergo decay and annihilation. For that which perisheth, once existed, nor can any thing undergo destruction, which hath never been. Now as the nature of the creature is perceived to remain in very truth as it was before, it is clear there is no change of this kind herein wrought.

XIII.—Further, there is not here that change, which is from one kind of being to another, which we see in things that undergo change of quality, (for example, when that which was before black is altered into white,) for we here detect no change in taste, colour, or smell. If then there is no change at all, it is the same which it was before.

* *i.e.* as truth was defined above.

But in truth it is somewhat else, since the bread is made the Body, and the wine the Blood of Christ. Christ Himself hath said, "Take, eat, this is My Body." Likewise speaking of the cup, He saith, "Take, drink, this is the Blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for you." *Mat.* xxvi., 26. *Mat.* xxvi., 28. *Luke* xxii., 20.

XIV.—They therefore, who will here take nothing figuratively, but will have the whole matter consist in simple truth, must be asked, in what respect that change takes place, by which the elements come to be, what they were not before, (namely, bread and wine,) but the Body and Blood of Christ? For according to the nature of the creatures, and their form as visible things, neither the bread nor wine have ought changed in them. And if they have undergone no change at all, they are nought else than they were before.

XV.—Your Highness perceiveth, illustrious Prince, whither their opinion tendeth, who think thus: they deny that, which they are believed to affirm, and are convicted of overthrowing that, which they believe. They indeed faithfully confess the Body and Blood of Christ, and by so doing, without doubt they profess that the elements are not that same thing, which they were before; and if they are other than they were before, they have undergone some change. Since this cannot be denied, let them say in what respect they are changed. For no bodily change can be seen in them. They must therefore confess, either that they are changed in respect of something else than their corporeal substance, and that therefore they are not what in truth they seem to be, but somewhat else, which they evidently are not in their proper essence: or, if they will not acknowledge this, they are forced to deny that they are the Body and Blood of Christ, which is impious, not only to say, but even to think. They who will admit no figure in the Eucharist, contradict themselves.

XVI.—Yet because they do confess that they are the Body and Blood of Christ, and that they could not be so, but by a change for the better; and since this change is not corporally but spiritually wrought, it followeth, that we must acknowledge it to be done in a figure, since under the veil of corporeal bread and corporeal wine, the spiritual Body and the spiritual Blood of Christ do exist. Not that two things co-exist diverse between themselves, namely body and spirit, but one and the same thing hath in one respect the nature of bread and wine, in another is the Body and Blood of Christ. As far as they are corporally handled, they

are in their nature, corporeal creatures, but in their power, and as they are spiritually made, they are the mysteries of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Analogy from the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.

XVII.—Let us consider the font of Holy Baptism, which is styled, not without reason, the Fountain of Life, because it forms afresh those who descend into it with the newness of a better life, and gives back alive to righteousness those who were dead in sin. Hath it this power, in that it is, as we see it, the element of water? Unless it received a sanctifying grace, it could by no means wash away the stain of sin. Unless it possessed a life-giving power, it could in no sort give life to those who are dead—dead, I mean, not in the flesh, but in soul. For in that font, if we have respect to that alone, which meeteth the bodily senses, we see the mere element of water subject to corruption, and able to wash the body only. But the power of the Holy Ghost is added thereunto by the consecration of the Priest; and it is made efficacious to wash not the body only, but the soul too, and by its spiritual virtue to remove spiritual stains.

XVIII.—See how in one and the same element two things are contained, the one contrary to the other, that which is subject to corruption giving incorruption, that which hath not life conveying life. We know then that in this font there is that, which corporeal sense can touch, and therefore subject to change and corruption; and again there is that, which faith only can behold, and therefore neither corruptible nor mortal. If you ask what washeth the body outwardly, it is the element, but if you ponder on that which purgeth the inward parts, it is a quickening power, a sanctifying power, a power of immortality. Wherefore in its proper nature it is a corruptible fluid, but in a mystery it is a healing power.

XIX.—So too the Body and Blood of Christ, considered outwardly, are creatures subject to change and corruption. But if you weigh the power of the mystery, they are life, giving immortality to such as partake thereof. They are then not the same, as they are seen, and as they are believed; according to that they are seen, they feed a corruptible body, themselves corruptible; according to that they are believed, they feed our souls, which shall live for ever, themselves immortal.

Analogy

XX.—The Apostle too, writing to the Corinthians, saith, "Know

ye not, that all our Fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ." We observe that the sea and the cloud bore the likeness of Baptism, and that the Fathers of the Old Testament were baptised in them, that is, in the cloud, and in the sea. Could then the sea, in respect of what it was to outward sight, an element, have the power of Baptism? Or could the cloud in respect of what it was to outward sight, a condensation of thick air, have power to sanctify the people? Yet we dare not say that the Apostle, who spake in Christ, did not with truth affirm that our Fathers were baptized in the cloud, and in the sea.

from the baptism of the Fathers in the sea and in the cloud.

1 *Cor.* x., 1—4.

XXI.—And though that baptism bore not the form of the Baptism of Christ, which at this day is performed in the Church, yet no sane person will dare deny that of a truth it was baptism, and that in it our Fathers were baptised, unless he madly presume to contradict the words of the Apostle. Wherefore both the sea and the cloud conveyed the cleansing of sanctification, not in respect of their bodily substance, but in respect of that, which they inwardly contained, the sanctification of the Holy Ghost. For in them there was both a visible form, apparent to the bodily senses, not in image, but in truth; and also a spiritual power, which shone forth within, discernible not by the eye of the flesh, but of the soul.

XXII.—In like sort the manna, which was given to the people from heaven, and the water, which flowed from the rock, had a corporeal existence, and were meat and drink for the bodies of the people; yet the Apostle calleth that manna and that water spiritual meat and spiritual drink. How so? because in those corporeal substances the spiritual power of the Word was contained, which was meat and drink to the souls rather than the bodies of believers. And although that meat and that drink foreshewed the mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ, Who was to come, which the Church now celebrates, yet St. Paul affirmeth that our Fathers did eat the same spiritual meat, and drink the same spiritual drink.

Analogy from the manna and the water from the rock.

XXIII.—Perchance you ask, what same? the very same, which at this day the company of the faithful eateth and drinketh in the

Church. For we may not think them diverse, since one and the same Christ gave His own Flesh for food, and His own Blood for drink, to that people, who, in the desert, were baptized in the cloud and in the sea, and now in the Church feedeth the congregation of the faithful with the Bread of His Body, and giveth them to drink of the stream of His Blood.

XXIV.—The Apostle intending to intimate thus much, after saying our Fathers ate the same spiritual meat and drank the same spiritual
1 *Cor.* x., 4. drink, immediately addeth, "For they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ." To the end we might understand, that in the wilderness the same Christ was in the spiritual Rock, and gave the stream of His Blood to the people, Who afterwards exhibited in our age His Body taken of the Virgin, and hanged upon the cross, for the salvation of believers, and shed from it the stream of His Blood, to the end we might not only be redeemed by it, but also have it for our drink.

XXV.—In very deed this is wonderful, since we cannot comprehend its depth, nor weigh its value. He had not as yet assumed man's nature; He had not as yet tasted death for the salvation of the world; He had not as yet redeemed us with His Blood; and still our Fathers in the desert, by means of that spiritual meat, and that invisible drink, did eat His Body and drink His Blood, as the Apostle testifieth when
1 *Cor.* x., 4. he saith, "Our Fathers ate the same spiritual meat, and drank the same spiritual drink." Here we must not enquire how that could be done, but must believe that it was done. For He who now in the Church by His Almighty power spiritually changeth bread and wine into the Flesh of His Body, and the stream of His own Blood, at that time too wrought invisibly, so that the manna, which was given from heaven, and the water, which flowed from the Rock, became His Body and His Blood.

Ps. lxxviii., 25. XXVI.—This David understood and testified in the Holy Ghost, saying, "Man did eat Angels' food." For it were a fond thing to suppose that the corporeal manna, which was given to the Fathers, feedeth the host of heaven, or that they use such diet, who are satisfied with the feast of the Divine Word. Of a truth the Psalmist, or rather the Holy Ghost speaking in the Psalmist, teacheth us, both what our Fathers received in that heavenly manna, and what the faithful ought

to believe in the mystery of Christ's Body. In either surely is Christ signified, who feedeth the souls of believers, and is Angels' food. This too He doth and is, not by bodily taste, nor by becoming bodily food, but by the power of the spiritual Word.

Argument from the words of the Institution. *Luke* xxii., 19, 20.

XXVII.—We know also on the testimony of the Evangelist, that our Lord Jesus Christ, before He suffered, "took bread, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to His disciples, saying, 'This is My Body, which is given for you: do this in remembrance of Me.' Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, 'This cup is the New Testament in My Blood, which shall be shed for you.'" We see that, though Christ had not yet suffered, He still, even then, wrought the mystery of His Body and Blood.

XXVIII.—For sure am I, no believer doubteth that the bread which He gave to His disciples, saying, "This is My Body, which is given for you," was made the Body of Christ; or that the cup of which He also said, "This cup is the New Testament in My Blood, which shall be shed for you," contained the Blood of Christ. As then, a little before His passion, He was able to change the substance of bread and the creature of wine, into His own Body, which was to suffer, and into His Blood, which was afterward to be shed; so too in the desert he had power to change the manna and the water from the rock, into His own Flesh and Blood, though long time was to pass ere that Flesh was to hang on the cross for us, or that Blood to be shed for our cleansing.

Exposition of *John* vi., 53.

XXIX.—Here too we must consider, how His words are to be taken, "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye shall not have life in you." He doth not say that His Flesh, which hung on the cross, should be cut in pieces, and eaten by His disciples, or that His Blood, which He was to shed for the redemption of the world, should be given to His disciples to drink. It had been an horrible crime for His disciples to drink His Blood, or to eat His Flesh, as the unbelieving Jews then understood Him.

John vi., 61, 62.

XXX.—Wherefore in the words following, He saith to His disciples, who received His words not in unbelief but in faith, though they did not fully see, how those words were to be understood, "Doth this offend you? what and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" as though He said, "Think not that My Flesh is

to be corporally eaten, or My Blood corporally drunk by you, that it is divided, or to be hereafter divided into parts, for after My resurrection ye shall see Me ascend into Heaven with the fulness of My entire Body, and Blood. Then shall ye understand that My Flesh is not to be eaten by believers, as the faithless suppose, but that bread and wine truly, yet mystically changed into the substance of My Body and Blood, is to be received by them."

John vi., 63. XXXI.—And immediately he addeth, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." He saith that the flesh profiteth nothing as those unbelievers understood it, but otherwise it giveth life, as it is mystically received by the faithful. And why so? He Himself declareth, saying, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." Wherefore in this mystery of the Body and Blood, it is the spiritual working that giveth life, without which working those mysteries avail nothing; they may feed the body, but cannot feed the soul.

XXXII.—Here ariseth that question, which very many propose when they say, that these things are done, not in figure, but in truth; in speaking thus, they are proved to contradict the writings of the Holy Fathers.

St. Augustine quoted. XXXIII.—St. *Augustine*, a chief doctor of the Church, in his third book of Christian Doctrine, thus writeth:* "'Except ye eat' (saith the Saviour) 'the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye shall not have life in you.' He seemeth to command a flagitious crime. His words therefore are in a figure, bidding us communicate in the Lord's passion, and faithfully store up in our memory, that His Flesh was crucified and wounded for us."

XXXIV.—We see this doctor saith, that the mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ is celebrated by the faithful under a figure; for carnally to receive His Body and Blood is not, he saith, an act of religion, but a crime. So were they minded, who in the Gospel took our Saviour's words not spiritually but carnally, who departed from Him, and followed Him no more.

XXXV.—The same Father in his Epistle to *Boniface* the bishop, among other things, thus writeth:† "We often speak in this manner,

* St. August. concerning Christian Doctrine, book iii. ch. 16.
† St. August. Epist. xcviii. § 9.

when the Pasch draweth nigh, To-morrow or the next day is the Lord's Passion, though He suffered so many years ago, and that but once for all. Likewise we say on the Lord's day, On this day the Lord rose again, though so many years have passed since He rose. Why then is none so foolish, as to charge us with falsehood for so speaking? It is because we name the days after their likeness to those, on which the things themselves were done; whence that is called the day of His resurrection, which is not so indeed, but like it in the revolution of time: and by reason of the celebration of the Sacrament, that is said to be done on this very day, which not on this day, but in former time was done. Was not Christ once sacrificed in His own Person? and yet in the Sacrament He is offered up for the people, not only during all the Paschal solemnity,* but every day. Wherefore he lieth not, who, when questioned, answereth that Christ is now sacrificed. For if Sacraments had not some resemblance to those things, of which they are the Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all. But from this resemblance they oft-times take the names of the things themselves. As then after a certain sort the Sacrament of the Body of Christ is the Body of Christ, and the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ, the Blood of Christ, so too the Sacrament of the faith† is the faith."

XXXVI.—We see St. *Augustine* saith, that Sacraments are one thing, and the things of which they are Sacraments another. For the Body, in which Christ suffered, and the Blood, which flowed from His side, are the things themselves; whilst the mysteries of these things are the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, which are

* "The ancients commonly included fifteen days in the whole solemnity of the Pasch, that is, the week before Easter Sunday, and the week following it: the one of which was called the Pasch of the Cross, and the other, the Pasch of the Resurrection. The general name Pascha, which is of Hebrew extract from Pesach, which signifies the Passover, will comprise both. For the Christian Passover includes as well the Passion as the Resurrection of our Saviour, Who is the true Paschal Lamb or Passover, that was sacrificed for us. And, therefore, though our English word, Easter, be generally used only to signify the Resurrection, yet the ancient word, Pascha, was taken in a larger sense, to denote as well the Pasch of the Crucifixion, as the Pasch of the Resurrection." Bingham, Antiq. b. xx. ch. 5. § 1.

† The Sacrament of the faith] That is, Baptism, as the words of St. Augustine immediately following shew. "When the answer is made [*i.e.* at Baptism] that the little one believeth, who hath not yet the affection of faith, the answer that he hath faith is made on account of the Sacrament of faith, and that he turns to God on account of the Sacrament of conversion."

celebrated in memory of the Lord's passion, not only during the whole Paschal solemnity in every year, but also every day throughout the year.

XXXVII.—And although the Body of Christ, in which He once suffered, is one, and His Blood, which was shed for the salvation of the world, is one, yet the Sacraments of these things have assumed the names of the things themselves, so as to be called the Body and Blood of Christ; and this, from their likeness to the things, which they shadow forth; even as the Passion and the Resurrection, which are celebrated every year, are so called, though He suffered and rose again in His own Person but once, nor can those days now be recalled, since they have passed away. Yet the days, on which the Passion or Resurrection of the Lord is commemorated, are so called in that they have a resemblance to those days, on which the Saviour once suffered and rose again.

XXXVIII.—Whence we say, To-day or to-morrow or the next day is the Passion or the Resurrection of the Lord, though the very days, on which these things were done have for many years passed away. So we may say, The Lord is sacrificed, when the Sacrament of His passion is celebrated, though He were but once sacrificed in His own
1 *Pet.* ii., 21. Person for the salvation of the world, as the Apostle saith, "Christ hath suffered for us, leaving you an example that ye should follow His steps." Not that He suffereth in His own Body every day—that He did once—but He hath left us an example, which is daily presented to believers in the mystery of the Lord's Body and Blood; so that whoso approacheth thereto, may know that he must have fellowship with Him in His sufferings, the image whereof he waiteth for in these sacred
Prov. xxiii., 1. mysteries, according to that saying of Wisdom, "Thou hast drawn near to the table of a mighty one, consider diligently what is set before thee, knowing that thou thyself must prepare the like."* To draw near to a mighty one's table, is to become a partaker of the Lord's offering. To consider what is set before us, is to discern the Lord's Body and Blood. Of which whoso partaketh, let him consider that he ought to prepare like things, that He may imitate Him by fellowship

* knowing ... like] These words are not in the Hebrew. The Septuagint version has them, and it is evident that they existed in some old Latin versions, as they are quoted by St. Ambrose and St. Augustine. They are not in the Vulgate.

in His death, the memory whereof he confesseth, not by believing only, but also by tasting.

XXXIX.—So St. *Paul* to the Hebrews: "For such an High Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for His own sins, and then for the people's; for this the Lord Jesus Christ did once, when He offered up Himself." What He did once, He daily repeateth; He once offered Himself for the sins of the people, yet the same oblation is every day celebrated by the faithful, but in a mystery; so that what the Lord Jesus Christ by once offering Himself fully accomplished, this in remembrance of His passion is every day performed by the celebration of the mysteries. *Heb.* vii., 26, 27.

XL.—Yet it is not false to say that in those mysteries the Lord is sacrificed, or suffers, since they have a likeness to that death and passion, the representations of which they are. Whence they are styled the Lord's Body and the Lord's Blood, for they take the name of those things, of which they are the Sacraments. Hence St. *Isidore*, in his book of Etymologies, speaketh thus:* "*Sacrificium* sacrifice is so called from *sacrum factum*, a thing made sacred, because it is consecrated by mystical prayer, in remembrance of the Lord's passion on our behalf. Whence by His command, we call that the Body and Blood of Christ, which, though made of the fruits of the earth, is sanctified, and becomes a Sacrament by the invisible operation of the Spirit of God. The Sacrament of this bread and cup the Greeks call Eucharist, which the Latins interpret *Bona Gratia*, Good grace. And what can be better than the Body and Blood of Christ? [Now the bread and wine are for this cause compared to the Lord's Body and Blood, because as the visible substance of this bread and wine doth nourish and cheer the outward man, so the Word of God, which is the living Bread, doth refresh the souls of the faithful by the participation of Himself."†]

XLI.—This Catholic doctor also teacheth, that this holy mystery of our Lord's passion is to be celebrated in memory of the Lord's passion on our behalf. By so saying, he shews that the Lord's passion

* St. Isidore, Orig. book vi. ch. 19.

† The words in brackets are not in the present copies of Isidore.

was once accomplished, but that the memory of it is represented in sacred and solemn rites.

XLII.—So that the bread which is offered, though taken from the fruits of the earth, is by consecration changed into Christ's Body, and the wine, though it hath flowed from the Vine, yet by the consecration in this divine mystery is made the Blood of Christ, not indeed visibly, but, as this doctor saith, by the invisible operation of the Spirit of God.

XLIII.—Whence they are called the Body and Blood of Christ, because they are received not as what they outwardly appear, but as they are made inwardly by the operation of the Spirit of God. And as through this invisible power they have a nature far different from that which outwardly appeareth, he maketh a distinction, saying, that bread and wine are for this cause compared to the Lord's Body and Blood; because as the visible substance of bread and wine doth nourish and make cheerful the outward man, so the Word of God, which is the living Bread, doth refresh the souls of the faithful by the participation of Himself.

XLIV.—Now in saying this, he most plainly confesseth, that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, whatever is outwardly received, is fitted for the refreshing of the body. But the Word of God, which is the invisible Bread, and existeth invisibly in that Sacrament, doth, by the participation of Himself, invisibly feed the souls of the faithful with a quickening virtue.

XLV.—Hence too, the same doctor saith, "There is a Sacrament in the celebration of any thing, when it is so performed, that it be understood to signify somewhat, which must be spiritually taken." By these words he sheweth that every Sacrament in divine matters containeth within itself some secret thing, and that it is one thing, which appeareth to the outward eye, whilst it is another, which must be taken on faith and not on sight.

XLVI.—Immediately after he sheweth what Sacraments the faithful ought to celebrate. "The Sacraments are Baptism and Chrism,* the Body and the Blood. These are called Sacraments, because under the

* "It is usual with the ancients to divide the proper Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, each of them into two or more, meaning the several parts or rites belonging to them. Thus Isidore speaks of four Sacraments in the Church, which are, Baptism, Chrism, the Body of Christ, and the Blood of Christ. As therefore the Bread and

covering of bodily things the power of God secretly worketh the salvation, which lieth in them. Whence from their hidden and sacred virtues they are called Sacraments." He afterward saith, "It is called in Greek *mysterion*, a mystery, because it hath a secret and hidden dispensation."

XLVII.—What are we hence taught, save that the Body and Blood of the Lord are styled mysteries, because they have a secret and hidden dispensation; or, in other words, that it is one thing, which they outwardly shew, and another, which they inwardly and invisibly do work.

XLVIII.—For this reason too they are called Sacraments, because under the covering of bodily things, the power of God doth secretly dispense salvation to the faithful recipient.

Summary of the foregoing argument.

XLIX.—From all that we have heretofore said, it hath been proved, that the Body and Blood of Christ, which in the Church are received by the mouths of the faithful, are figures in respect of their visible nature. But in respect of their invisible substance, that is, the power of the Word of God, they are truly the Body and Blood of Christ. Wherefore as far as they are visible creatures, they feed the body, but in virtue of a more powerful substance, they both feed and sanctify the souls of the faithful.

Second question.

L.—Now we must examine the second question proposed, and see, whether the self-same Body, which was born of Mary, which suffered, died, and was buried, and which sitteth at the right hand of the Father, be that, which daily in the Church is received by the mouths of the faithful in the mystery of the Sacrament.

St. Ambrose quoted.

LI.—Let us enquire what is the judgment of St. *Ambrose* on this point. He saith in his first book of the Sacraments,* "Of a truth it is marvellous that God should rain down manna on our Fathers, and feed them from day to day with heavenly food. Whence it is said, 'Man did eat Angels' food' Yet all they who ate that bread, perished in the wilderness. But that food, which thou receivest, that living Bread, which came down from heaven, ministereth in a hidden way the sub-

Ps. lxxviii. 25.

Wine are called two Sacraments, though they be but two parts of the same Eucharist, so the washing and the unction are called two Sacraments, though they be but two rites of the same Sacrament of Baptism." Bingham, Antiq. b. xii. ch. 1. § 4.

* St. Ambr. concerning Mysteries, c. viii. § 47.

stance of everlasting life, and whoso eateth of this Bread, shall never die, and this is the Body of Christ."

LII.—See in what sense this doctor saith that the Body of Christ is that food, which the faithful receive in the Church; he saith, "that living Bread which came down from heaven, ministereth in a hidden way the substance of everlasting life." Doth it, as it is seen, and corporally taken, and pressed by the teeth, and swallowed by the throat, and received into the belly, doth it so minster the substance of everlasting life? In that respect, it nourisheth only the flesh which shall die, and ministereth no incorruption, nor can we truly say of it, "Whoso eateth of this shall never die." For that which the body receiveth, is corruptible, nor can it secure to the body, that it should never die, since that which is subject to corruption, cannot give everlasting life. There is then in that Bread a life, which appeareth not to the bodily eye, but is seen by the eye of faith, which is the living Bread, that came down from heaven, and of which it may with truth be said, "Whoso eateth of this, shall never die;" and, "This is the Body of Christ."

John vi., 20.

LIII.—And afterward, speaking of the Almighty power of Christ, he saith, "Can not the word of Christ therefore, which from nothing could make that which was not, change those things which are, into that which they were not? For is it not a greater work to produce new things, than to change the nature of things that are?"

LIV.—St. Ambrose saith, that in that mystery of the Blood and Body of Christ a change is made, and that a wondrous change, because divine, and ineffable, because incomprehensible. Let them who will take nothing here according to any hidden virtue, but will weigh every thing as it outwardly appeareth, let them say, in what respect the change is here made? For in respect of the substance of the creatures, they are after consecration what they were before. Bread and wine they were before, and after consecration they are seen to remain of the same nature. So that a change hath inwardly been wrought by the mighty power of the Holy Spirit, and this is that which faith gazeth upon, this is that which feedeth the soul, this is that which ministereth the substance of eternal life.

LV.—Afterward he addeth, "Why dost thou here require the order

of nature in the Body of Christ, when the Lord Jesus Himself was born of the Virgin, beside the order of nature?"

LVI.—Now perhaps some one who heareth this may rise up and say, 'That which we see is the Body of Christ, and that which we drink is His Blood; yet we must not enquire how it is so made, but stedfastly hold that it doth so become.' Thou seemest indeed to think aright, yet if thou dost diligently consider the force of thy words, thou dost indeed faithfully believe that it is the Body and Blood of Christ, (for if it were an object of sight, thou wouldest say, 'I see,' and not, 'I believe it to be the Body and Blood of Christ,') but now since it is faith, that beholdeth the whole matter, whatever it be, and the eye of the flesh perceiveth nought, thou must understand that what we look upon is the Body and Blood of Christ not in nature, but in power. Wherefore [St. Ambrose] saith, 'we must not here look for the order of nature, but must adore the power of Christ, which changeth whatsoever He willeth, how He willeth, into what He willeth; which createth what was not, and when created, changeth it into what it was not before.' The same author addeth, "It was surely the true Flesh of Christ which was crucified, which was buried; therefore this is truly the Sacrament of His Flesh. The Lord Jesus Himself proclaims, 'This is My Body.'" *Mat.* xxvi., 26.

LVII.—How carefully, how warily is this distinction drawn! Of the Flesh of Christ, which was crucified, which was buried, that is, in respect of which Christ was crucified, and buried, he saith, "This was surely the true Flesh of Christ;" but of that, which is received in the Sacrament, he declareth, "Therefore this is truly the Sacrament of that Flesh." Here he distinguisheth between the Sacrament of the Flesh, and the Flesh itself; inasmuch as he saith, that He was crucified and buried in that true Flesh, which He took of the Virgin; but that the mystery, which is now performed in the Church, is the Sacrament of that true Flesh, in the which He was crucified. Here He openly teacheth the faithful, that the Flesh, in which Christ was cruciffed and buried, is no mystery, but true and natural; while the Flesh, which now in a mystery containeth the similitude of the former, is not Flesh in its nature, but in a Sacrament. For in its nature it is bread, but sacramentally it is the true Body of Christ, as the Lord Jesus Himself declareth, "This is My Body."

LVIII.—Also below [he addeth,] "The Holy Ghost by the mouth of the prophet hath in another place declared to thee what we eat and what we drink, when He saith, 'O taste and see that the Lord is good; blessed is the man that trusteth in Him.'" Doth that bread when corporally tasted, or that wine when corporally drunk, show how good the Lord is? All the taste it hath is corporeal, and pleaseth the palate. What? is to taste the Lord, to perceive ought corporeal? Wherefore he inviteth us to try the flavour of that which is spiritually tasted, he inviteth us in that drink and that bread to hold no corporeal notion, but to understand the whole spiritually, since the Lord is a Spirit, and blessed is the man that trusteth in Him.

Ps. xxxiv., 8.

LIX.—And afterward, "Christ is in that Sacrament, because it is the Body of Christ. Wherefore it is not corporeal, but spiritual food." What can be plainer? what more manifest? what more divine? For he saith, "Christ is in that Sacrament." He saith not, That bread and that wine is Christ; did he say this, he would declare that Christ was mortal and subject to corruption, (which God forbid.) For whatsoever is in that food the object either of corporeal sight or taste, is of a surety subject to corruption.

LX.—He addeth, "Because it is the Body of Christ." Here you will start up and say, See he openly confesseth that the bread and the wine are the Body [and Blood] of Christ. But mark how he concludeth, "Wherefore it is not corporeal, but spiritual food." Do not then apply your bodily senses; they can discern nought here. Of a truth it is the Body of Christ, yet not His corporeal, but His spiritual Body; it is the Blood of Christ, yet not His corporeal, but His spiritual Blood. Nought then is to be understood here corporally, but all spiritually. It is the Body of Christ, yet not corporally; it is the Blood of Christ, yet not corporally.

LXI.—Afterward he addeth, "Hence the Apostle, when speaking of its type, saith, 'Our Fathers ate spiritual meat, and drank spiritual drink.' For the Body of God is a spiritual Body, the Body of Christ is the Body of a divine Spirit; for Christ is a Spirit, as we read in the Book of Lamentations, 'Christ the Lord is the Spirit before our face.'"*

1 Cor. x., 3, 4.

Lam. iv., 20.

* This passage is applied to Christ by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Augustine. Christ in regard of His Divine Nature is often

LXII.—Most clearly hath he taught us, how we ought to understand the mystery of Christ's Body and Blood. For after saying, "Our Fathers ate spiritual meat and drank spiritual drink," (where no one doubteth that the manna they ate, and the water they drank, were corporeal,) he goeth on to define in what sense that mystery, which is performed in the Church, is the Body of Christ. He saith, "God's Body is a spiritual Body." Of a truth Christ is God, and the Body, which He took of the Virgin Mary, which suffered, was buried, and rose again, was a real Body, that is, the Body which ever remained the object of sight and touch. Whilst that Body, which is called the mystery of God, is not corporeal, but spiritual; and if spiritual, then an object neither of sight, nor touch. Wherefore St. Ambrose goeth on to say, "The Body of Christ is the Body of a divine Spirit." Now a divine Spirit in its proper essence is nought corporeal, nought corruptible, nought tangible. But this Body, which is celebrated in the Church, is in respect of its visible nature, both corruptible and tangible.

LXIII.—How then is it called the Body of a divine Spirit? Of a truth, as it is spiritual, that is, as it doth subsist, being invisible, impalpable, and therefore incorruptible.

LXIV.—Whence in the following words, "because Christ is a Spirit, as we read, 'Christ the Lord is the Spirit before our face;'" he openly sheweth in what respect it is held to be the Body of Christ; namely, as the Spirit of Christ is therein, that is, the power of the divine Word, which doth not feed only, but also purge the soul.

LXV.—Wherefore the same author goeth on to say, "Lastly, that food strengtheneth our heart, and that drink maketh glad the heart of man, as the Prophet testifieth." Doth then corporeal food strengthen, and corporeal drink make glad the heart of man? No. But to shew of what meat and drink he is speaking, he significantly adds, *that* meat and *that* drink. What is *that* meat and *that* drink? Of a truth it is the Body of Christ, the Body of a divine Spirit, and (that he may impress this more clearly upon us) Christ the Spirit, of whom Scripture saith, "Christ the Lord is the Spirit before our face." By all which

Ps. civ., 15.

Lam. iv., 20.

spoken of by the Fathers as the Spirit, and the Spirit of God, as Bp. Bull has shewn. Def. Fid. Nic. I. ii. 95. Agreeable to this are the following passages of Scripture, which he cites; *Mark* ii. 8. *Rom.* i. 3, 4. 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. *Heb.* ix. 14. 1 *Pet.* iii. 18, 19, 20. *John* vi. 63 with 56.

it is clearly shewn, that nothing should be understood corporally in that food, and that drink, but all should be spiritually taken.

LXVI.—For the soul, which is meant by the heart of man in this place, is not fed by corporeal meat, or corporeal drink, but is nourished by the Word of God, and groweth thereby. Which the same doctor affirmeth yet more clearly in his fifth book of the Sacraments,* where he saith, "It is not that bread which goeth into the body, but that Bread of eternal life, which in a hidden manner doth minister substance to our soul."

LXVII.—The subsequent part of the passage most clearly sheweth, that St. Ambrose spoke thus, not of common bread, but of the Bread of the Body of Christ. For he is speaking of that daily Bread for which the faithful pray.

LXVIII.—And he therefore addeth, "If it is your daily Bread, why do you receive it but once a year, as the Greeks in the East are wont to do. Receive then daily that which daily may profit, and live so, that day by day you may be worthy to receive." It is clear then of what Bread he is speaking; namely, of the Bread of the Body of Christ, which supporteth the substance of our soul, not by that, which passeth into the body, but by that, which is the Bread of everlasting life.

LXIX.—By the authority of this most learned man, we are taught, that the difference is wide between the Body, in which Christ suffered, and the Blood, which when hanging on the cross He shed from His side, and that Body, which in the mystery of Christ's passion is daily celebrated by the faithful, and that Blood, which is taken by the mouths of the faithful, that to them it may be the mystery of that Blood, by which the whole world was redeemed. For that bread and that drink are not the Body and Blood of Christ in respect of what meeteth the eye, but as they spiritually minister in a hidden way the substance of life. But the Body, in which Christ once suffered, bore no other appearance than that in which it really subsisted. It was that, which truly† was seen, was touched, was crucified, was buried. In like sort the Blood, which flowed from His side, did not appear one thing outwardly, and veil another thing inwardly; true Blood flowed from a

* St. Ambr. on the Sacraments, b. v. c. 4. † *i.e.* not figuratively, see § 7, 8.

true Body; but now the Blood of Christ, which the faithful drink, and His Body, which they eat, are one thing in nature, and another in signification. They are one thing as they feed the body with corporeal food, and another thing, as they satisfy the soul with the substance of everlasting life.

LXX.—Of which matter St. *Hierom*, in his commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians, writeth thus:* "The Blood of Christ, and the Flesh of Christ, are taken in two senses. They are either that spiritual and divine Flesh [and Blood], of which He Himself saith, 'My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed;' or the Flesh, which was crucified, and the Blood, which was poured out by the soldier's spear." St. Hierom quoted. *John* vi., 55.

LXXI.—The difference is not small with which this doctor distinguisheth concerning the Body and Blood of Christ. For whilst he saith that the Body and Blood of Christ, which are daily taken by the faithful, are spiritual; while the Flesh, which was crucified, and the Blood, which was poured out by the soldier's spear, are not said to be spiritual, or divine; openly doth he insinuate, that these two differ from one another no less than things corporeal and spiritual, visible and invisible, divine and human. And, because they differ, they are not the same; but the spiritual Bread, which is taken by the mouths of the faithful, and the spiritual Blood, which is daily presented to be drunk by believers, differ from the Flesh, which was crucified, and the Blood, which was poured out by the soldier's spear, as the testimony of this author sheweth; therefore they are not the same. Christ's Body and Blood taken in two senses.

LXXII.—For that Flesh, which was crucified, was made of the Virgin's flesh, bound together by bones and sinews, and marked out by the lines of human members, and animated with the breath of a reasonable soul, for its own proper life, and befitting motions. But, on the other hand, that spiritual Flesh, which spiritually feedeth the company of the faithful, as to the form which it outwardly beareth, is made of grains of corn by the baker's hand, is bound together by no sinews or bones, is not parted into various members, is animated by no reasonable substance, hath no power to exercise any motions of its own. For whatsoever therein giveth us the substance of life,

* S. Hier. on the Ep. to the Eph. c. 1.

in its power is spiritual, in its efficacy invisible, in its virtue divine. It is far different, as to its outward appearance, and as to that, which in the mystery is believed. Moreover, the Flesh of Christ, which was crucified, had no other outward show than what it inwardly was, inasmuch as it was the very flesh of a very man, a true body consisting in the nature of a true body.

The Sacramental Bread a figure of the people as well as of Christ's Body.

LXXIII.—It is further to be considered, that in that Bread; not the Body of Christ alone is figured, but also that of the people who believe in Him. Wherefore it is made of many grains of corn, as the Body of faithful people is made up of many, that believe through the word of Christ.

LXXIV.—For which reason, as that Bread is taken to be the Body of Christ in a mystery, so likewise are the members of the people that believe in Christ signified in a mystery. And as that Bread is called the Body of believers not corporally, but spiritually; so also we must understand the Body of Christ not corporally, but spiritually.

As is also the water mixed with the wine.

LXXV.—So too, with the wine, which is called the Blood of Christ, water is ordered to be mixed, nor is the one allowed to be offered without the other;* because, as the head cannot be without the body, nor the

* This custom prevailed universally, and from the earliest times, in the Christian Church, both in the East and West. Justin Martyr of Syria, St. Irenæus of Gaul, and St. Cyprian of Carthage, bear testimony to the fact in the second and third centuries. It is probable, that the cup which our Saviour blessed at the Last Supper, contained water as well as wine; for the Paschal cup, which He used in instituting the Eucharist, was always so prepared by the Jews. The reasons which St. Cyprian (Ep. lxiii.) gives for this custom are the same as those of Ratramn. He saith; "Holy Scripture declareth that water signifieth the people," quoting *Rev.* vii. 15. "Which we see too in the Sacrament of the Cup. For since Christ, Who bore our sins, beareth us all also, we perceive that in the water the people is understood, in the wine the Blood of Christ is represented. But when in the cup water is mixed with wine, then the people is united to Christ, and the company of believers is closely joined to Him, in Whom they believe. Which union of water and wine in the cup of the Lord is so intimate, that the elements when mingled cannot be separated one from the other. Whence nothing whatever can separate the Church (*i.e.* the people built up in the Church, and faithfully and firmly abiding in that which it believeth,) from Christ, or prevent that love continuing firm and undivided. Thus in consecrating the cup of the Lord, water cannot be offered alone, as also wine cannot be offered alone; for if the wine be offered by itself, the Blood of Christ beginneth to be without us; and if the water be alone, the people beginneth to be without Christ: but when both are mingled together, and joined each to each by an intimate union, then a spiritual and heavenly Sacrament is produced." Bingham gives a further account of this custom. Ant. b. xv. c. ii. § 7.

body without the head, so neither can the people be without Christ, nor Christ without the people. Moreover, the water in that [part of the] Sacrament beareth the image of the people. If therefore that wine, when consecrated by the office of the Minister, is corporally changed into the Blood of Christ, the water also, which is mixed with it, must necessarily be corporally changed into the blood of the faithful people. For where the consecration is one, there followeth also one operation; and where the cause is the same, the mystery which followeth is the same also. But we see no change made in the water, as to bodily substance; and therefore, there is no corporeal change in the wine. Whatever in the water signifieth the people of Christ, is taken spiritually; whatever therefore in the wine representeth the Blood of Christ, must be taken spiritually too.

LXXVI.—Again, things that differ from each other, are not the same. The Body of Christ, which died, which rose again, and being made immortal "dieth no more, nor hath death any more dominion over Him;" that Body is eternal, and no longer subject to suffering. But the Body, which is celebrated in the Church, is temporal, not eternal; corruptible, not incorruptible. They differ then from each other, and therefore are not the same. Now if they be not the same, how are they said to be the very Body and very Blood of Christ?

The elements not incorruptible, therefore not Christ's natural Body and Blood. *Rom.*vi.,9.

LXXVII.—For if it be the Body of Christ, and if it be truly* said that it is the Body of Christ; then it is in verity the Body of Christ; and if it be in verity the Body of Christ, then it is the incorruptible and impassible, and therefore eternal, Body of Christ. And therefore, this Body of Christ, which is celebrated in the Church, must be incorruptible and eternal. But no one can deny that that thing is corrupted, which is broken into parts and distributed to be taken; which is ground by the teeth, and passeth into the body. But in truth that which is presented outwardly, is one thing, and that which is by faith believed, another; that which appertaineth to the bodily senses, is corruptible, but that which faith believeth, is incorruptible. That therefore which outwardly appeareth, is not the thing itself, but its image; but that which is perceived and understood by the soul, is the very thing itself.

LXXVIII.—Whence St. *Augustine* in his exposition of St. John's

St. Augustine quoted.

* *i.e.* not figuratively, see § 7, 8.

Gospel,* when treating of the Body and Blood of Christ, saith thus; "Moses ate manna, and Aaron ate, and Phinees ate, and many more ate there, who pleased God, and died not. Wherefore? Because they spiritually understood that visible food, they were spiritually an hungred, they spiritually tasted, that spiritually they might be satisfied. For we too at this day receive visible food; yet the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament another." The same Father addeth;

John vi., 50. "This is the Bread which came down from heaven, this Bread the manna, this Bread the altar of God signified. Those things were Sacraments, differing in signs, yet the same in the thing signified.

1 *Cor.* x., 1—4. Listen to the Apostle Paul; 'For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, how that all our Fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat;' that is to say, the same spiritually, for corporally they were diverse; they ate manna, and we eat another meat; yet spiritually they ate the same as we." He addeth, "'and did all drink the same spiritual drink.' They drank one, we another, diverse only in outward show, which yet in spiritual power signified this very same thing. For how did they drink of the same drink? 'They drank,' he saith, 'of the spiritual Rock, which followed them, and that Rock was Christ.' Thence had they meat, whence they had drink. In figure the Rock was Christ, but the true Christ was in the Word and in Flesh."

John vi., 50. LXXIX.—Again (it is written), "this is the Bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die." But this hath reference to the virtue of the Sacrament, not to the visible part of the Sacrament; to him, who eateth inwardly, not outwardly; who feedeth on it in his heart, not who presseth it with his teeth.

LXXX.—Again he introduceth our Saviour's words, when in a following passage he speaketh thus, "'Doth this offend you that I said, I give My Flesh to you to eat, and My Blood to drink? What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?' What meaneth this? He here resolveth that, which troubled them, He here layeth open that, at which they were offended. For they thought He would give them His own Body; whilst He said that He

John vi., 61, 62.

* St. Augustine on *St. John*, ch. vi. Tract. 16. § 11.

was about to ascend into Heaven whole and entire. When ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before, ye shall then at least see of a surety, that He giveth not His Body, in the way in which ye think; then at least shall ye of a surety understand, that His grace is not consumed by the teeth. And He saith, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.'"

LXXXI.—Again he addeth after some interval, "'If any man' (saith the Apostle) 'hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.' 'It is the Spirit therefore which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.' What meaneth, they are Spirit and they are Life? They are to be understood spiritually. Dost thou understand them spiritually? They are Spirit and they are Life. Dost thou understand them carnally? Even then they are Spirit and they are Life, but not to thee." *Rom.* viii., 9. *John* vi., 63.

LXXXII.—By the authority of this doctor, when treating of our Lord's words concerning the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, we are manifestly taught, that these words of our Lord are to be understood spiritually, not carnally. As He saith Himself, "The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life," namely, the words which concern the eating of His Flesh and the drinking of His Blood. For He speaketh of that, at which His disciples were offended. In order then that they might not be offended, our divine Master recalleth them from the flesh to the spirit, from the objects of bodily sight to the understanding of things invisible. *John* vi., 64.

LXXXIII.—We see then, that that food of the Lord's Body, and that drink of His Blood, subsist truly as His Body, and truly as His Blood, after a certain sort; namely, in that they are Spirit and Life.

LXXXIV.—Again: things which are the same, are comprehended under one definition. Of the true Body of Christ it is said, that He is very God, and very Man: God, begotten of God the Father before the worlds; Man, born of the Virgin Mary in the end of the world. But since this cannot be said of the Body of Christ, which in the Church is mystically celebrated, we know that it is the Body of Christ after a certain manner, the manner namely of figure and image, so that the thing itself might be felt to be the truth.*

* *i.e.* That we may perceive Christ Himself, Who is the truth and the reality, shadowed forth under the figure and image of the symbols. See § 100.

He argues from a Prayer in use in his time.

LXXXV.—In the prayers used after the mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ, to which the people answer, Amen, the Priest speaketh thus;* "We, who have received the pledge of eternal life, humbly beseech Thee to grant that we may receive by manifest participation that, which we touch under the image of the Sacrament."

LXXXVI.—Now a pledge and image are the pledge and image of some other thing; that is, they do not respect themselves, but somewhat else. For a pledge is the pledge of that thing, for which it is given; an image is the image of that, the likeness whereof it sheweth forth. For they do not openly exhibit, but only signify those things, of which they are the pledge and the image. Wherefore, it followeth, that this Body and Blood are the pledge and image of some future thing, whereby that, which is now exhibited under a likeness, shall hereafter be openly revealed. Since then they now represent that, which shall hereafter be revealed, it followeth that that, which is now celebrated, is one thing, while that, which shall be revealed hereafter, is another.

LXXXVII.—Wherefore that, which the Church celebrated, is both the Body and Blood of Christ; but yet as a pledge, as an image. The Truth we shall then possess, when pledge and image shall be no more, but the thing itself in verity shall appear.

He argues from another Prayer.

LXXXVIII.—And in another Prayer,† "O Lord, we beseech Thee, let Thy Sacraments work in us, that which they contain; so that, what we now celebrate in figure, we may receive in very truth." He saith that these things are celebrated in figure, not in truth, that is, in the likeness, not by the exhibition of the thing itself. Now figure and truth differ from one another; wherefore the Body and the Blood, which is celebrated in the Church, differ from that Body and that Blood, which is acknowledged to be already glorified in Christ's Body. This Body is the pledge and figure, but that is the truth itself. This will continue to be celebrated till we come to that other; but when we come to that Body, this shall be taken away.

LXXXIX.—It appeareth therefore that they differ as much from

* This prayer is not found in the present Roman Mass Book. It is extant in the second book of the Sacraments of the Church of Rome, edited by Thomasius. Rome, 1680, p. 160.

† This Prayer is in the ordinary Roman Mass Book.

each other, as a pledge doth from that thing, of which it is given to us as the pledge, as much as an image doth from that thing, of which it is the image, as much as the figure doth from the truth. We see then that the mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ, which is now received in the Church by the faithful, is separated by a wide difference from that, which was born of the Virgin Mary, which suffered, was buried, which rose again, which ascended into Heaven, which sitteth at the right hand of the Father. For that which is done on our journey, is to be spiritually received, because faith believeth that, which it seeth not; it spiritually feedeth the soul, and maketh glad the heart, and giveth everlasting life, and incorruption, while we look not upon that, which feedeth the body, which is pressed by the teeth, which is divided into parts, but upon that, which is spiritually received in faith. But that Body, in which Christ suffered and rose again, still existeth as His proper Body, which He took of the body of the Virgin Mary, which even after His resurrection could be handled and seen, as He Himself said to His disciples, "Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have." *Luke* xxiv., 39.

XC.—Let us hear also what St. *Fulgentius* saith in his book concerning faith.* "Most firmly hold, and doubt not in any sort, that the Only-Begotten Son, God the Word, when made Flesh, offered Himself for us, a sacrifice and oblation to God for a sweet-smelling savour. To Whom, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, animals were sacrificed in the time of the Old Testament by Patriarchs, Prophets, and Priests, and to Whom now, that is, in the time of the New Testament, together with the Father and the Holy Ghost, with Whom He hath one and the same Divinity, the Holy Catholic Church throughout the world ceaseth not to offer the sacrifice of Bread and Wine in faith and love. In those carnal victims there was a signification of the Flesh of Christ, which He without sin was to offer for our sins, and of that Blood, which for the remission of our sins He was to pour forth. Whilst in this sacrifice there is the thanksgiving, and commemoration of the Flesh of Christ, which He hath offered for us, and of the Blood, which He hath shed for us. Of which the Blessed Apostle Paul speaketh in the Acts of the Apostles, 'Take heed to yourselves and to the whole *Acts* xx., 28. St. Fulgentius quoted.

* Fulgentius on faith to Peter the deacon, ch. 19.

flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers to rule the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own Blood.' In those sacrifices, therefore, what was to be given us was figuratively signified; but in this sacrifice, what has already been given us, is evidently shewn."

XCI.—When he saith, that in those sacrifices there was a signification of what should be given us, but in this sacrifice a commemoration of what has been given us, he clearly implieth, that, as the one had a figure of things to come, so this sacrifice too is a figure of things past.

XCII.—By these words he most evidently sheweth, how great is the difference between the Body, in which Christ suffered, and this Body, which is for the commemoration of His passion and death. For the one is His proper and true Body, and hath naught in it of mystery or figure; the other is mystical, and sheweth one thing by a figure outwardly, while it representeth another thing inwardly through the understanding of faith.

St. Augustine quoted again.

XCIII.—Let me allege one other testimony of the Father *Augustine*, which will confirm what I have said, and conclude my discourse. In his sermon to the people concerning the Sacrament of the altar,* he thus speaketh; "What ye now see on the altar of God, ye saw also on the night that is past; but as yet ye have not heard what it is, what it meaneth, and of how great a thing it containeth the Sacrament. What ye see then, is the bread and the cup, which even your eyes declare to you; but the point in which your faith requireth instruction is this; that the bread is the Body of Christ, the cup is the Blood of Christ. This is but briefly stated, and it may suffice for faith, yet faith requireth instruction. For the Prophet saith, 'If ye will not believe, ye shall not understand.' Ye may therefore say to me, Thou hast bidden us to believe; explain that we may understand. A thought like the following may arise in some one's mind; We know whence our Lord Jesus Christ took flesh, from the Virgin Mary, He was suckled as an infant, He was nourished, He grew, He came to years of manhood, He suffered persecution of the Jews, He was hung on the tree, He was slain, He was taken down from the tree, He was buried, the third day He rose again, He ascended into heaven on the day He willed, thither He raised His own Body, thence He shall come to judge

Is. vii., 9.

* This sermon is extant at the conclusion of the letter of Fulgentius to Ferrandus the deacon, concerning the Baptism of the dying Æthiopian.

the quick and dead, there He now sitteth at the right hand of the Father. How then can the bread be His Body? and the cup, or what the cup containeth, how can it be His Blood? These, brethren, are called Sacraments for this reason, because in them one thing is seen, and another understood; that which is seen hath a corporeal nature, that which is understood, hath a spiritual fruit."

XCIV.—This venerable author, in these words, instructeth us what we ought to think of our Lord's proper Body, which was born of Mary, and now sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and in which He will come to judge the quick and the dead, and what of that, which is placed on the altar, and received by the people. The former is entire, is neither cut nor divided, nor veiled under any figure; the latter, which is set on the Lord's Table, is a figure, because it is a Sacrament: as it is outwardly seen, it hath a corporeal nature, which feedeth the body; as it is inwardly understood, it hath a spiritual fruit, which quickeneth the soul.

XCV.—When he would speak somewhat more openly and clearly of this mystical body, he addeth the following words, "Wherefore if ye wish to understand the Body of Christ, hearken to the words of the Apostle, 'Ye are the Body and members of Christ.' If therefore ye are the Body and members of Christ, your own mystery is laid on the Lord's Table, ye receive your own mystery, ye answer, Amen, to that which ye are, and by so answering ye subscribe thereto. Thou hearest, The Body of Christ, and thou answerest, Amen.* Be thou a member of the Body of Christ, that this Amen may be true. But why so in bread? Let us allege nought of our own, but let us hearken to the Apostle, when he saith concerning that Sacrament, 'We being many are one bread, and one body, &c.'" 1 Cor. xii., 27. 1 Cor. x., 17.

XCVI.—St. Augustine sufficiently teacheth us, that, in the bread which is placed on the altar, the Body of Christ is signified, as well as

* This refers to the form of administering the Eucharist in the ancient Church, which was thus. The Priest said, "The Body of Christ," and "The Blood of Christ;" to each of which the people subjoined "Amen." By the time of Gregory the Great, the form of delivery was a little enlarged; for then they said, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul." And by the time of Alcuin and Charles the Great, it was augmented into this form, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul unto everlasting life;" which is very much the same with the former part of that which is now used in our Liturgy. See Bingham, Ant. b. 15. ch. 5. § 8.

the body of the people who receive, to the intent he might plainly shew Christ's proper Body to be that, in which He was born of the Virgin, in which He was suckled, in which He suffered, in which He died, in which He was buried, in which He rose again, in which He ascended into heaven, in which He sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and in which He shall come to judgment. But that, which is placed on the Lord's Table, containeth the mystery of that Body, as also again it containeth the mystery of the body of believing people, as the Apostle testifieth, "We being many are one bread and one body in Christ."

He determines the second question in the negative.

XCVII.—Your wisdom, most illustrious Prince, may understand, that it hath been most clearly shewn, by the testimony of Holy Scripture, and the words of the Holy Fathers, that the bread, which is called the Body of Christ, and the cup, which is called the Blood of Christ, is a figure, because it is a mystery; and that the difference is not small between the Body, which existeth in mystery, and the Body, which suffered, died, and rose again. For the one is the proper Body of our Saviour; no figure, no hidden signification, but the manifestation of the reality itself is there acknowledged, and the vision of this believers still desire; for He is our Head, and with the vision of Him our desire shall be satisfied; inasmuch as He and the Father are One, not in respect of the Body, which the Saviour hath, but in respect of the fulness of the Godhead, which dwelleth in the Man Christ.

XCVIII.—But in this other, which is celebrated in a mystery, there is a figure not only of the proper Body of Christ, but also of the people that believe in Christ. For it beareth the figure of either body, that is, of the Body of Christ, which suffered and rose again, and of the people, who in Christ are born again and quickened from the dead.

XCIX.—Let us moreover add, that the bread and the cup, which is both called and is the Body and Blood of Christ, doth represent the memory of our Lord's passion and death, as He saith Himself in the Gospel, "Do this in remembrance of Me." Which the Apostle Paul explaineth when he saith, "As often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come."

Luke xxii., 19.
1 *Cor.* xi., 26.

C.—We are taught both by our Saviour, and by St. Paul the Apostle, that this bread and cup, which are placed on the altar, are placed there in figure or in memory of the Lord's death, that they may recall to our present remembrance that which was done in times past, so that being

put in remembrance of His passion, we may by it be made partakers of the heavenly gift, whereby we have been freed from death; knowing well that when we shall arrive at the vision of Christ, we shall have no need of such like instruments, to remind us what His boundless mercy hath endured for us. For we shall then see Him face to face, we shall not be reminded by the outward admonition of temporal things, but by the contemplation of the Truth itself shall see, how we ought to render thanks to the Author of our salvation.

CI.—Yet let it not be thought, from my saying this, that in the mystery of the Sacrament, the Body and Blood of the Lord are not received by the faithful, for faith receiveth that which it believeth, not that which the eye beholdeth. It is spiritual meat, and spiritual drink, spiritually doth it feed the soul, and giveth life, which shall satisfy for ever, as our Saviour saith Himself, when commending to us this mystery, "It is the Spirit which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." *John* vi., 63.

CII.—In my desire to obey your Majesty's command, I have presumed, though of slender powers, to dispute on a subject of no small importance. I have followed no presumptuous opinion of my own, but have had regard to the authority of the ancients. If you approve what I have said, as Catholic, ascribe it to the merit of your own faith, which disdained not to lay aside your kingly glory and magnificence, and to enquire from an humble subject an answer of truth. But if it please you not, ascribe it to my weakness, which hath failed sufficiently to explain that, which it desired.

Here endeth the book of Ratramn on the Body and Blood of the Lord.

PASCHAL HOMILY,

BY ÆLFRIC,

FROM THE REPRINT OF 1623.

A Sermon of the Paschall Lambe, and of the Sacramentall Body and Bloud of Christ our Saviour. Written in the old Saxon tongue before the Conquest, and appointed in the reigne of the Saxons to be spoken unto the people at Easter before they should receive the Communion. London, Printed by John Haviland for Henry Seile. 1623.

Men beloved, it hath beene often said unto you about our Saviours resurrection, how he on this present day after his suffering mightily rose from death. Now will wee open unto you through Gods grace, of the holy housell, which ye should now goe unto, and instruct your understanding about this mysterie, both after the old covenant, and also after the new, that no doubting may trouble you about this lively food. The Almighty God bade Moses his Captain in the land of Ægypt, to comand the people of Israel to take for every family a lambe of one yeere old the night they departed out of the countrey to the land of promise, and to offer that lambe to God, and after to kill it, to make the signe of the Crosse with the lambes blood upon the side posts, and the upper post of their doore, and afterward to eat the lambes flesh rosted, and unleavened bread, with wilde lettisse.

God saith unto Moses, Eat of the lambe nothing raw, nor sodden in water, but rosted with fire. Eat the head, the feet, and the inwards, and let nothing of it be left untill the morning: if any thing thereof remaine, that shall ye burn with fire. Eat it in this wise: Gird your loines, and doe your shooes on your feet, have your staves in your hands, and eat it in haste, this time is the Lords Passover. (*Ex.* xii., 9—11.) And there was slain on the night in every house throughout

Pharaos reigne the first borne child: and Gods people of Israel were delivered from that sodain death through the lambes offring and his blouds marking. Then said God unto Moses; Keepe this day in your remembrance, and hold it a great feast in your kinreds with a perpetuall observation, and eat unleavened bread alwayes seven days at this feast. (*Ex.* xii., 14.) After this deed God led the people of Israel over the red sea, with dry foot, and drowned therein Pharao and all his armie together with their possessions, and fed afterward the Israelites fortie yeeres with heavenly food: and gave them water out of the hard rocke, untill they came to the promised land. Part of this storie wee have treated of in another place, part wee shall now declare, to wit, that which belongeth to the holy housell. Christian men may not now keepe that old law bodily, but it behoveth them to know, what it ghostly signifieth. That innocent lambe which the old Israelites did then kill, had signification after ghostly understanding of Christs suffering, who unguiltie shed his holy bloud for our redemption: hereof sing Gods servants at every Masse, *Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis:* That is in our speech, *Thou Lambe of God that takest away the sinnes of the world have mercy upon us.* Those Israelites were delivered from that sodaine death, and from Pharaos bondage by the lambes offering, which signified Christs suffering through which wee be delivered from everlasting death, and from the devil's cruell reigne, if we rightly beleeve in the true Redeemer of the whole world Christ the Saviour. That Lambe was offered in the evening, and our Saviour suffered in the sixt Age of this World. This Age of this corruptible World is reckoned unto the evening. They marked with the lambes bloud upon the doores and the upper postes Tau, that is the signe of the Crosse, and were so defended from the Angell that killed the Ægyptians first borne childe. And we ought to marke our foreheads, and our bodies with the token of Christ's roode, that wee may be also delivered from destruction, when we shall be marked both on forehead, and also in heart with the bloud of our Lords suffering. Those Israelites eat the lambes flesh at their Easter time, when they were delivered, and we receive ghostly Christs body, and drink his bloud, when we receive with true beliefe that holy housell. That time they kept with them at Easter seven dayes with great worship, when they were delivered from Pharao, and went from

that Land. So also Christen men keepe Christs resurrection at the time of Easter, these seven dayes, because through his suffering and rising wee bee delivered, and be made cleane by going to this holy housell, as Christ saith in his Gospell: Verily verily I say unto you, ye have no life in you, except ye eat my flesh, and drinke my bloud. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my bloud, abideth in me, and I in him, and hath that everlasting life, and I shall raise him up in the last day. (*John* vi., 53, 54.) I am the lively bread, that came downe from heaven, not so as your fore-fathers eat that heavenly bread in the wildernesse, and afterward died. He that eateth this bread, he liveth for ever. (*John* vi., 48—51.) Hee blessed bread before his suffering, and divided to his Disciples, thus saying, Eat this bread, it is my body, and doe this in my remembrance. (*Matt.* xxvi., 26; *Luke* xxii., 19.) Also hee blessed wine in one Cup, and said; Drinke yee all of this: This is my bloud that is shed for many, in forgivenesse of sinnes. (*Matt.* xxvi., 28.) The Apostles did as Christ commanded, that is, they blessed bread and wine to housell againe afterward in his remembrance. Even so also since their departure all Priests by Christs commandement doe blesse bread and wine to housell in his name with the Apostolike blessing.

Now some men have often searched, and doe yet often search, how bread that is gathered of corne, and through fires heat baked, may be turned to Christs bodie, or how wine that is pressed out of many grapes, is turned through one blessing to the Lords bloud. Now say we to such men, that some things be spoken of Christ by signification, some thing by thing certaine. (See *Ratramn*, § 8) True thing is, and certaine, that Christ was borne of a Maid, and suffered death of his owne accord, and was buried, and on this day rose from death. (*Ratr.* § 7.) He is said bread by signification, and a Lambe and a Lion, and a Mountaine. He is called bread, because hee is our life and Angels life. (*John* i., 29.) Hee is said to be a Lambe for his innocencie (*Rev.* v., 5); A Lion for strength, wherewith he overcame the strong Devill. (*Is.* ii., 2.) But Christ is not so notwithstanding after true nature neither Bread, nor a Lambe, nor a Lion. Why is then that holy housell called Christs Body, or his Bloud, if it be not truly that it is called? Truly the Bread and the Wine which by the Masse of the Priest is hallowed, shew one thing without to humane

understanding, and another thing they call within to beleeving minds. (*Ratr.* § 9.) Without they be seene Bread and Wine both in figure and in taste, and they be truly after their hallowing, Christs Body and his Bloud, through ghostly mystery.

An Heathen Child is Christened, yet he altereth not his shape without, though he be changed within. He is brought to the Font stone sinfull, through Adams disobedience. Howbeit, hee is washed from all sinne within, though hee hath not changed his shape without. Even so the holy Font-water (*Ratr.* § 17), that is called the well-spring of life, is like in shape to other waters, and is subject to corruption, but the holy Ghosts might commeth to the corruptible water, through the Priests blessing, and it may after wash the body and soule from all sinne, through ghostly might. Behold now we see two things in this one creature. (*Ratr.* § 18.) After true nature that water is corruptible water, and after ghostly mystery, hath hallowing might. So also if wee behold that holy housell after bodily understanding, then see wee that it is a Creature corruptible and mutable (*Ratr.* § 19): if we acknowledge therein ghostly might, then understand we that life is therein, and that it giveth immortalitie to them that eat it with beleefe. Much is betwixt the invisible might of the holy housell, and the visible shape of his proper nature; it is naturally corruptible bread, and corruptible wine: and is by might of God's word truly Christs body and his bloud: not so notwithstanding bodily, but ghostly.

Much is betwixt the body Christ suffered in, and the body that is hallowed to housell. (*Ratr.* § 71, 72.) The body truly that Christ suffered in was borne of the flesh of Marie, with bloud, and with bone, with skin, and with sinewes, in humane lims, with a reasonable soul living: and his ghostly body, which we call the housell, is gathered of many cornes: without bloud, and bone, without lim, without soule; and therefore nothing is to be understood therein bodily, but all is ghostly to be understood. Whatsoever is in that housell, which giveth substance of life, that is of the ghostly might, and invisible doing. Therefore is that holy housell called a mysterie, because there is one thing in it seene, and another thing understood. That which is there seene, hath bodily shape: and that we do there understand, hath ghostly might. Certainly Christs body which suffered death, and rose

from death, never dieth henceforth: but is eternal and unpassible. (*Ratr.* § 76, 77.) That housell is temporal, not eternall: corruptible, and dealed into sundry parts: chewed between teeth, and sent into the belly: howbeit neverthelesse after ghostly might, it is all in every part. Many receive that holy Body, and yet notwithstanding, it is so all in every part after ghostly mystery. Though some chewe lesse deale, yet is there no more might notwithstanding in the more part, then in the lesse, because it is all in all men after the invisible might. This mystery is a pledge and a figure: Christs body is truth it selfe. (*Ratr.* § 87, 88.) This pledge we doe keep mystically, untill that we be come to the truth itselfe, and then is this pledge ended. Truly it is so as we before have said, Christs Body and his Bloud: not bodily but ghostly. And ye should not search how it is done, but hold it in your beleefe that it is so done.*

* * * * * * *

But now heare the Apostles words about this mystery. Paul the Apostle speaketh of the old Israelites thus, writing in his Epistle to faithful men. All our Fore-fathers were baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea: and all they ate the same ghostly meat, and drank the same ghostly drinke. (1 *Cor.* x., 1—4.) They dranke truly of the stone that followed them, and that stone was Christ. Neither was that stone then from which the water ranne, bodily Christ, but it signified Christ, that calleth thus to all beleeving and faithful men: Whosoever thirsteth, let him come to me and drinke. (*John* vii., 37, 38.) And from his bowels floweth lively water. This he said of the holy Ghost, whom he receiveth which beleeveth on him. The Apostle Paul saith, that the Israelites did eat the same ghostly meat, and drinke the same ghostly drinke: because that heavenly meat, that fed them forty yeeres, and that water which from the stone did flow, had signification of Christs body and his bloud, that now be offered daily in Gods Church. It was the same which we now offer, not bodily, but ghostly. Wee said unto you erewhile (*Ratr.* § 23), that Christ hallowed bread and wine to housell before his suffering, and said: This is my Body and my Bloud. Yet hee had not then suffered (*Ratr.* § 24, 25): but so notwithstanding hee turned through invisible

* Here follow two tales from the Vita Patrum, of which it is said in the margin, "These tales seeme to be infarced."

might that bread into his owne Body, and that wine to his bloud, as he before did in the wildernesse, before that he was borne to men, when he turned that heavenly meat to his flesh, and the flowing water from that stone to his owne bloud.

Very many ate of that heavenly meat in the wildernesse, and dranke that ghostly drinke, and were neverthelesse dead, as Christ said. (*Ratr.* § 78.) And Christ meant not that death which none can escape, but that everlasting death, which some of that folke deserved for their unbeleefe. Moyses and Aaron, and many other of that people which pleased God, eat that heavenly bread, and they died not that everlasting death, though they died the common death. They saw that the heavenly meat was visible and corruptible, and they ghostly understood by that visible thing, and ghostly received it.

The Saviour saith, He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloud, hath everlasting life. (*John* vi., 54.) And he bade them not eat that body which hee was going about with, nor that bloud to drinke which hee shed for us: but hee meant with those words that holy housell, which ghostly is his body and his bloud, and hee that tasteth it with beleeving heart, hath that eternall life.

In the old Law (*Ratr.* § 90), faithfull men offered to God divers sacrifices, that had fore-signification of Christs body, which for our sinnes, he himselfe to his heavenly Father hath since offered to sacrifice. Certainly this housell which wee doe now hallow at Gods Altar, is a remembrance of Christs body which hee offered for us, and of his bloud, which hee shed for us: So he himselfe commanded, Doe this in my remembrance. (*Luke* xxii., 19.) Once suffered Christ by himselfe but yet neverthelesse his suffering is daily renewed at the Masse through mystery of the holy housell. (*Ratr.* § 38.) Therefore that holy Masse is profitable, both to the living, and to the dead; as it hath beene often declared. Wee ought also to consider diligently (*Ratr.* § 73, 74), how that this holy housell is both Christs body, and the body of all faithfull men, after ghostly mystery. As the wise Augustine saith of it; If ye will understand of Christs body, heare the Apostle Paul, thus speaking. (*Ratr.* § 95.) Ye truly be Christs body, and his members. (1 *Cor.* xii., 27.) Now is your mystery set on Gods table, and ye receive your mystery; which mystery ye your selves be. Be that which ye see on the Altar, and receive that which

ye yourselves be. Againe, the Apostle Paul saith by it: We many be one bread, and one body. (1 *Cor.* x., 17.) Understand now and rejoyce, many be one bread, and one body in Christ. He is our head, and wee be his limmes. And the bread is not of one corne, but of many. Nor the wine of one grape, but of many. So also wee all should have one unitie in our Lord, as it is written of the faithfull Army, how that they were in so great an unity, as though all of them were one soule, and one heart. (*Acts* iv., 32.) Christ hallowed on his Table the mystery of our peace and of our unitie: he which receiveth that mystery of unity, and keepeth not the bond of true peace, he receiveth no mystery for himselfe, but a witnesse against himselfe.

It is very good for Christen men, that they goe often to housell, if they bring with them to the Altar unguiltinesse and innocency of heart. To an evill man it turneth to no good, but to destruction, if he receive unworthily that holy housell.

Holy bookes command that water be mingled to that wine which shall be for housell (*Ratr.* § 75): because the water signifieth the people, and the wine Christs bloud. And therefore shall neither the one without the other be offred at the holy masse: that Christ may be with us, and we with Christ; the head with the lims, and the lims with the head.

We would before have intreated of the lambe which the old Israelites offered at their Easter time, but that we desired first to declare unto you of this mystery, and after how we should receive it. That signifying lambe was offered at the Easter. And the Apostle Paul saith in the Epistle of this present day, that Christ is our Easter, who was offered for us, and on this day rose from death. The Israelites did eat the lambes flesh as God commanded with unlevened bread and wilde lettise: so we should receive that holy housell of Christs body and bloud without the leaven of sinne and iniquitie. As leaven turneth the creatures from their nature, so doth sinne also change the nature of man from innocencie to foule spots of guiltinesse. The Apostle hath taught how wee should feast not in the leven of evilnesse, but in the sweet dough of puritie and truth. The herb which they should eat with the unlevened bread is called lettise, and is bitter in taste; so we should with bitternesse of unfained weeping purifie our minde if we will eat Christs body. Those Israelites were

not wont to eat raw flesh, although God forbade them to eat it raw and sodden in water, but rosted with fire. He shall receive the body of God raw, that shall thinke without reason that Christ was onely man like unto us, and was not God. And he that will after mans wisdome search of the mystery of Christ's incarnation, doth like unto him that doth see the lambes flesh in water; because that water in this place signifieth mans understanding; but we should understand that all the mysterie of Christs humanity was ordered by the power of the holy Ghost. And then eat we his body rosted with fire, because the Holy Ghost came in fires likenesse to the Apostles in divers tongues. The Israelites should eat the lambes head, and the feet, and the purtenance, and nothing thereof must be left over night. If any thing thereof were left, they did burne that in the fire, and they brake not the bones. After ghostly understanding, we do then eat the lambes head when we take hold of Christs divinitie in our beleefe. Again; when we take of his humanitie with love, then eat we the lambes feet; because that Christ is the beginning and end, God before all world, and Man in the end of this world. What be the lambes purtenance but Christs secret precepts; and these we eat when we receive with greedinesse the word of life. There must nothing of the lambe be left unto the morning, because that all Gods sayings are to be searched with great carefulnesse; so that all his precepts may be knowne in understanding and deed in the night of this present life, before that the last day of the universall resurrection doe appeare. If we cannot search out throughly all the mysterie of Christs incarnation, then ought we to betake the rest unto the might of the holy Ghost with true humilitie, and not to search rashly of that deepe secretnes above the measure of our understanding. They did eat the lambes flesh with their loines girt. In the loines is the lust of the body; and he which will receive that housell, shall restraine the concupiscence, and take with chastitie that holy receit. They were also shod. What be shooes but the hides of dead beasts. We be truly shod if we follow in our steps and deeds the life of those pilgrims which please God with keeping of his commandements. They had staves in their hands when they ate. This staffe signifieth a carefulnesse and a diligent overseeing; and all they that best know and can, should take care of other men, and stay them up with their helpe. It was injoyned to the eaters, that they should eat the lambe

in haste. For God abhorreth slothfulnesse in his servants, and those he loveth that seek the joy of everlasting life with quicknesse and haste of minde. It is written, Prolong not to turne unto God, lest the time passe away through thy slow tarrying. (*Ecclus.* v., 7.) The eaters might not breake the lambes bones. No more might the souldiers that did hang Christ breake his holy legs, as they did of the two theeves that hanged on either side of him. And the Lord rose from death sound without all corruption; and at the last judgement they shall see him whom they did most cruelly hang on the crosse. This time is called in the Hebrew tongue *Pasca*, and in Latine *Transitus*, and in English a *Passover;* because that on this day the people of Israel passed from the land of Ægypt over the Red Sea, from bondage to the land of promise. So also did our Lord at this time depart, as saith John the Evangelist, from this world to his heavenly Father. Even so we ought to follow our head, and to goe from the devill to Christ, from this unstable world to this stable kingdome. Howbeit we should first in this present life depart from vice to holy vertue, from evil manners to good manners, if we will after this corruptible life goe to that eternall life, and after our resurrection to Christ. He bring us to his everliving Father, who gave him to death for our sinnes. To him be honour, and praise of well-doing, world without end. Amen.

APPENDIX A.

I FEEL deeply grieved to be compelled to differ from the great body of the Evangelical clergy and laity of the Church of England, and others out of it, in the use of the term "baptismal regeneration." It is always a misfortune when the use of an ambiguous word is made the test of orthodoxy; and such I conceive to be the case with the term referred to. I do not say that there is not much in the baptismal controversy beyond verbal distinction; but I do think that the use of a phrase which has, within a recent period, changed its meaning, and which is by one party used in its old signification, and by the other in its new, has embroiled the discussion of the question, and led to much misunderstanding on both sides I would with much diffidence crave a consideration of the following views on the subject.

The term "regeneration" is used but twice in the whole of the Bible, and that twice is in the New Testament. It first occurs in Matthew xix., 28: "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And again, in Titus iii., 5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Now there can be no question but that in this latter verse the word is applied strictly to the outward part in baptism, the inward part being added immediately afterwards, "and by the renewing of the Holy Ghost." It is, however, highly probable that the word has the same signification in both places, and we will enquire briefly what that appears to be.

Commentators are very much divided in their opinions as to whether the phrase "in the regeneration," should be pointed off so as to be taken with what precedes or what succeeds it. My own opinion

inclines to the former, and I would read, "Ye, which have followed me in the regeneration," *i.e.*, in the present new state of things—in the gospel dispensation. The word would then be nearly equivalent with the term "Christian," in common use among ourselves, as referring to the economy under which we live. Most persons who read the words with those which precede them give them this interpretation, which appears to me both natural and apposite.

And would not such appear to be the sense of the word in the Epistle to Titus? There were baptisms of various characters and significance. The Jews had long practised a baptism; John had introduced another, and Jesus Christ yet another. When, therefore, the apostle is alluding to baptism, he may not unnaturally be supposed to distinguish Christian baptism by the term "the washing of regeneration," affixing to it the "inward part or thing signified,"—"the renewing of the Holy Ghost." In this view of the matter, the word under consideration will have the same meaning in both cases where it is used, and will distinguish the Christian dispensation from the Jewish, which preceded it.

But whatever view be taken of the exact meaning of the word, there can be no difference of opinion as to its application. It is used by the apostle with undoubted reference to the application of the outward sign in baptism; and in refusing to use the term "baptismal regeneration," because the phrase, perhaps, is abused, I cannot but think that the Evangelical portion of the Church place themselves in a false position. There is no one point in which they put such power into the hands of their Popish and other assailants to damage them withal, as by this refusal. First of all they forsake the phraseology of St. Paul, who applies the word regeneration to water baptism; secondly, they turn their back upon all the divines, ancient and modern, who have written upon the subject, (with the exception of some of the Puritan divines without, and still fewer within the Church, during the last 150 years); and, lastly, they seem to me to be compelled to repudiate the language used by their own Church. Each of these is a very serious evil; but in combination, they form a heavy artillery, which is used with no sparing hand against the essential truths which are prominently put forward by that school of theologians.

This evil appears to me to have arisen from a change which has but recently taken place in the use of the word "regeneration." This was formerly used by all divines as little more than a synonyme for baptism. *Nati et renati* meant, even in the mouths of such men as Bishop Davenant, born and baptised. It is, moreover, evident that

the holy and faithful men, who encountered the fearful responsibility of reforming the English Church in the sixteenth century, used it in the same sense. Their existing writings, as well as our own public formularies, shew this. Now, however, the word is used as a synonyme with "conversion." This, in all probability, has arisen from confounding the "born again" in the third of John with "regeneration;" for, however close the verbal relationship may seem in the two cases, I believe it is nothing more than in seeming. It is indeed a pity that the particle ἄνωθεν in St. John should ever have been in that passage rendered by the word "again." Its primary signification of "from above" would have suited better, and it is so rendered lower down in the same chapter (v. 31), where "again" could have no place. The question of Nicodemus, "How can a man be born when he is old; can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" (v. 4,) does not at all set aside this remark, because as *a birth* was spoken of by our Lord, it was impossible but that it must be a *second* one, even if Nicodemus had not entertained the gross idea of the meaning of Jesus which he did.

The term "baptismal regeneration," as used by the Apostle Paul, by the early Fathers, and by the Church of England and her divines, means no more than *brought into the outer Church by baptism, and put into a salvable state.* It does not express the *absolute* condition of the individual as saved or lost, but his *relative* state. For as we are brought into the world by nature "children of wrath," damnable, but not damned; so we are hereby made "children of grace," salvable, but not saved. When more than this is said, it assumes that the inward part has accompanied the outward, of which we are no judges as to the nature or extent. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."—(*John* iii., 8.) It is not for us to fix the time at which the "Spirit is given to every one to profit withal," though we may conclude, from the appointment of baptism and its reference to the Spirit, that it is commonly bestowed in the ordinance. Yet we know that it is sometimes given *before*, as in the case of Cornelius: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which *have received* the Holy Ghost as well as we?"—(*Acts* x., 47.) And *not always in* baptism; for, after Simon Magus had been baptized, Peter told him, "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God."—(*Acts* viii., 21.) Who, then, will be bold to dogmatize, when it is manifest, from the inspired records, what we might well have con-

cluded, even without the knowledge of these cases, that God is not tied to any ordinances, not even to those of his own appointing?

It has long appeared to me, that the doctrine of the Trinity is intimately connected with the doctrine of the sacraments, and that the Three Persons and their offices are intended to be kept constantly before man's view by visible representations. That this was the case in the old Testament dispensation, is, I think, manifest enough, and any one who doubts it, or indeed who has not *considered* the subject, would do well to consult a small unpretending volume of the London Tract Society, entitled "The Philosophy of Salvation," a reprint of the work of an American (I believe a solicitor), which *proves* that the Mosaic economy was one of *pictorial representation*.

But as there are only *two* sacraments, "How," it may be asked, "can they represent the *three* divine persons of revelation?" The answer is this: the Father, the Creator, needs no other sacrament than his works. A man's own existence, as well as that of every thing around, proves, every moment of his conscious being, the existence of an all-powerful, all-wise, creative agent. This is well put by the Apostle Paul, when he says, "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the visible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead."—(*Rom.* i., 19, 20.) What need, then, can there be any further to represent creative agency, when every created thing is a sacrament of it?

Such, however, is not the case with the work of redemption or of sanctification. There is nothing in nature to represent them, and the economy of grace has supplied that wherein nature was lacking. "Do this in remembrance of me," was the command to continue a sensible embodiment of the great work of a Saviour. The institution of the Lord's Supper is intended for perpetuating, and calculated to perpetuate, the recollection of the great sacrifice (which is as unknown to physical nature, as it is above and beyond man's innate ideas), as was the celebration of the paschal feast, to prevent the deliverance in Egypt from lapsing from the memory. There was no necessary connection between bread and wine and the Lord's body and blood, and it was only the appointment which made them a sacrament. The answer of the Church of England to the question, "Why was the sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?" is both scriptural, and in accordance with the nature of things true: "For the continual remembrance of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby."

It was, I believe, the same feeling, that the administration of baptism should be admonitory of the Spirit's work, which made the Church of England order that the rite should be administered in full congregations; a thing, alas! too frequently neglected. In the homily on "Common Prayer and Sacraments," it is said, "To administer a sacrament is, by the outward word and element to preach to the receiver the inward and visible grace of God; and also for that both these exercises were first instituted, and are still continued, to the end that the congregation of Christ might from time to time be put in remembrance of their unity in Christ."—*Hom. on Common Prayer.*

And again in the rubric, before the baptismal service in the prayer-book, it is very properly suggested that "the people are to be admonished, that it is most convenient that baptism should not be administered but upon Sundays, and other holy-days, when the most number of people come together; as well for that the congregation there present may testify the receiving of them that be newly baptized into the number of Christ's Church; as also because in the baptism of infants every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to God in his baptism." It is not very satisfactory to reflect, how infrequent is the public administration of what is called "public baptism." Nothing is more calculated, in my opinion, to favour the idea of the *opus operatum* of formalists than this all but secret celebration of one of the Church's most solemn public rites. What follows in the next article has a further reference to the same subject.

APPENDIX B.

The Church of England is often blamed for putting into the mouths of her younger members the assertion, "in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," and I think most unreasonably blamed. It appears to me that no one, how low soever his opinion of baptism may be, ought to object to the use of such language, for which there is the clearest Scriptural warrant, even when it cannot be used in its fullest and best signification. There can be no doubt but that every one baptized is entered into covenant, and constituted a member of Christ's visible Church; and if no more than this could be predicated or hoped of the baptized person, it is enough to justify the language of the Church. But surely there are few who will presume to limit the effect of this sacred rite to so meagre a measure, and dogmatically to define the working of the Spirit in his own peculiar ordinance in Christ's Church! In adducing a few passages to prove that the Church of England is justified in using the above quoted phraseology of *all* her children, I will not go to the Old Testament, and shew that the whole Jewish people are constantly called *God's* people, even when they are declared not to be his in a higher and better sense; for instance, such passages as "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, *my people* doth not consider," (*Isa.* i., 3); for there would be no end of such quotations. I will rather confine myself to apostolic examples, being convinced that no one can read the Epistles carefully, and without prejudice, but must see that the privileges of the Christian covenant are constantly said to belong to all who are "called to be saints," whether they come up to the character or not, *i.e.* to all the baptized, with respect to some of whom the apostle declares that they walk "unworthy of their heavenly calling."

I would, then, earnestly claim for the following passages a calm and dispassionate consideration:—"As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. Now ye are the body of Christ and members in particular."—(1 *Cor.* xii., 12, 13, 14, 27.) And this language is used to the same Church to which, in a former part of the same letter, the apostle had said, not when he was supposing a case, but when he was reprobating a flagrant instance: "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid."—(I *Cor.* vi., 15.)

So, again, St. Paul says to the *whole* Church at Ephesus, "We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones," (v. 30); not that we can suppose that every individual member of that Church had this vital connection with the living head, but this relationship, assumed as real upon their profession of faith and baptism, is made the basis of a lengthened exhortation to realize it in a holy life and conversation.

So is it also with the phrase "child of God." It is used in a stricter, or more lax sense, according to the immediate purpose of the inspired writer. Thus we are told "the peacemakers shall be called the children of God," (*Matt.* v. 9,) which no doubt they are, *quantum hoc valeat.* In the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, the apostle twice uses the term "children of God" in the strictest sense; "the Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God," (v. 16); "the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," (v. 21); but in the following chapter it is twice used in its laxer signification of covenant relationship. In the first passage it distinguishes the relationship of Isaac's children to God from that of Ishmael's. "These which are the children of the flesh (*i.e.* Abraham's flesh), these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed," (v. 8); and in the second it is used to distinguish the people of a Christian from those of a heathen land. "I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God."—(*Rom.* ix., 25, 26.)

So, again, the same phrase is used in the Epistle to the Galatians,

to express covenant relationship, or that is predicated of *all* the Galatian Church, which was alone true of the sincere and pious. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," (*Gal.* iii., 26, 27, 29); in which latter verse the term "heirs" is applied to the same relationship.

Surely it will not be asserted that what is here declared generally of the body of believers, is or was certainly true of every individual in that body? In short, the apostle does not stop to enquire who are really what they seem, which he could not have decided if he had, but declares the privileges of the believers, *i.e.* of the Church in general, and leaves the question of individual acceptance (where it must always be left) between the soul and its God.

The same is the case with the words "heir" and "inheritance." They are sometimes used to express the closest union of character and relationship between Christ and his people, and sometimes they are used popularly with reference to the whole body of believers. When Paul was parting with the sorrowing Church at Ephesus, he uses the term inheritance in its highest significance. "And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified," (*Acts* xx., 32); and so, again, in Acts xxvi., 18. But when it is used, as it is several times in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, of the whole body of professing Christians, it cannot mean that each individual who formed a unit in that holy company was undoubtedly in possession of the full blessing "In whom we have obtained an inheritance," &c., "which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession," &c., appear to me to be beyond all question general expressions of corporate privileges, without reference to individual realization. So, again, in the midst of a lengthened and affecting assurance to the Church at Colosse, of his deep interest in their welfare, and of his earnest prayer for their advancement in Christian graces, the apostle says, "giving thanks unto the Father, which *hath made us meet* to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light," (i., 12,) taking for granted their corporate privileges, while he expresses his anxiety and offers his prayers, for their individual holiness and security.

Thus, again, in Ephesians iii., 6, we are told generally "That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel;" and in a general exhortation to

husbands and wives, Peter calls them "heirs of life," (1 *Peter* iii., 7,) where he certainly cannot refer to individual attainment, as he is not speaking of any particular person. Taking, then, the low ground of covenant relationship only, we find that the Church of England has ample Scriptural authority to declare what she does with regard to all baptized persons. But who will presume to say that the membership of the visible Church is all that is bestowed upon the majority of those who are admitted into it by baptism?

It is not our province to judge, except when we have *conduct* to guide our judgment; and when, in after life, we see many or even most of those who are called Christians, in virtue of their admission into the Church by baptism, living lives unworthy of their profession, we can only say that they have lost such grace as was imparted, or that it is for the present uninfluential for good. "The rest of their lives" is not "being spent according to the beginning," and their nominal membership in the Church, or in Christ the Church's head, will certainly avail them nothing in the great day of account, but rather add to their guilt and aggravate their condemnation. It is not ours to judge, but to believe and hope. "Let a man *examine himself*, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup," (1 *Cor.* xi., 28,) is the apostolic rule of preparation for the Lord's Supper, and which is strictly adhered to by our Church. If, then, in a matter where we might be supposed somewhat capable of forming an opinion of individual fitness for communion and Church membership, we are virtually excluded by St. Paul, much more must we be excluded in a case where we can have nothing upon which to base our judgment, wherein it is ours to obey the precept "Go and disciple all nations, baptizing them," and leave the result with God.

APPENDIX C.

How far *the nature of a sacrament* would allow the *water* to represent *an effect*, is an important question in Christian ethics. It appears to me extremely ridiculous to suppose that a *concrete substance* can prefigure an *abstract result*. That substance should represent substance, and effects effects, is consistent with reason and every-day experience; but the inversion of these is unnatural and absurd. That the bread and wine should represent the body and blood of Christ is reasonable; to be told that the benefit received in the Lord's Supper is that we obtain "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, *as* our bodies are (strengthened and refreshed) by the bread and wine," is natural; but to make the *effects* of the one representative of the *agent* in the other, would be manifestly incongruous in the nature of things. So, also, would it be in the other sacrament to do what Mr. Wilberforce would have us do, — viz., to consider the outward symbol, a type of the inward grace.

It is quite in keeping with our judgment to compare the *effects* of the water on the body with the *effects* of the Spirit on the soul, as well as to illustrate the one agent by the other; but to connect these pictorial representations crosswise, and signify cause by effect, and effect by cause, is to outrage reason and bid farewell to common sense. There is a natural aptness and congruity in the symbols and the things they signify according to the Protestant idea; the tractarian view, as propounded by Archdeacon Wilberforce, carries us back into the dark ages of science as well as of religion.

From a boy I have felt myself strong in the rejection of the other five so-called sacraments of the Popish Church, because they could not in any one case shew "the outward visible sign" and the "inward part or thing signified." The members of the Romish Church would get half way in their proof of the seven sacraments if they could shew these, but only half way; for they would still have to shew the "institution by Christ," without which they never could be binding, as sacraments, upon the Christian Church.

APPENDIX D.

[*Extract from Augustine's Commentary on the 99th Psalm.*]

"'And fall down before His footstool: for He is holy.' What are we to fall down before? His footstool What is under the feet is called a footstool, in Greek, *ὑποπόδιον*, in Latin, *Scabellum*, or *Suppedaneum*. But consider, brethren, what he commandeth us to fall down before. In another passage of the Scriptures it is said, 'The heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool,' (*Isa.* lxvi. 1.) Doth he then bid us worship the earth, since in another passage it is said, that it is God's footstool? How then shall we worship the earth, when the Scripture saith openly, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God?' (*Deut.* vi., 13.) Yet here it saith, 'fall down before His footstool,' and, explaining to us what His footstool is, it saith, 'The earth is My footstool.' I am in doubt; I fear to worship the earth, lest He who made the heaven and the earth condemn me; again, I fear not to worship the footstool of my Lord, because the Psalm biddeth me 'fall down before His footstool.' I ask, what is His footstool? and the Scripture telleth me, 'the earth is My footstool.' In hesitation I turn unto Christ, since I am herein seeking Himself: and I discover how the earth may be worshipped without impiety, how His footstool may be worshipped without impiety. For He took upon Him earth from earth; because flesh is from earth, and He received flesh from the flesh of Mary. And because He walketh here in very flesh, and gave that very flesh to us to eat for our salvation; and no one eateth that flesh, unless he hath first worshipped: we have found out in what sense such a footstool of our Lord's may be worshipped, and not only that we sin not in worshipping it, but that we sin in not worshipping, But doth the flesh give life? Our Lord Himself, when He was speaking in praise of this same earth, said, 'It is the Spirit

that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' Therefore, when thou bowest thyself down prostrate before the 'earth,' look not as if unto earth, but unto that Holy One whose footstool it is that thou dost worship; for thou dost worship it on His account: wherefore he hath added here also, 'fall down before His footstool, for He is holy.' Who is holy? He in whose honour thou dost worship His footstool. And when thou worshippest Him, see that thou do not in thy thought remain in the flesh, and be not quickened by the Spirit; for, He saith, 'it is the Spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing,' (*John* vi., 63.) But when our Lord praised it, He was speaking of His own flesh, and He had said, 'Except a man eat My flesh, he shall have no life in him,' (*John* vi., 54.) Some disciples of His, about seventy, were offended, and said, 'This is an hard saying, who can hear it?' And they went back, and walked no more with Him. It seemed unto them hard that He said, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you:' they received it foolishly, they thought of it carnally, and imagined that the Lord would cut off parts from His body, and give unto them; and they said, 'This is a hard saying.' It was they who were hard, not the saying; for unless they had been hard, and not meek, they would have said unto themselves, He saith not this without reason, but there must be some latent mystery herein. They would have remained with Him, softened, not hard: and would have learnt that from Him which they who remained, when the others departed, learnt. For when twelve disciples had remained with Him, on their departure, these remaining followers suggested to Him, as if in grief for the death of the former, that they were offended by His words, and turned back. But He instructed them, and saith unto them, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, but the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you, they are spirit, and they are life,' (*John* vi., 54—64.) Understand spiritually what I have said; ye are not to eat this body which ye see; nor to drink that blood which they who will crucify Me shall pour forth. I have commended unto you a certain mystery; spiritually understood, it will quicken. Although it is needful that this be visibly celebrated, yet it must be spiritually understood. 'O magnify the Lord our God, and fall down before His footstool, for He is holy.'"—*Oxford Lib. of the Fathers.*

APPENDIX E.

That the authority on which the idea of Melchisedec's offering is founded, and the judiciousness and sobriety with which the superstructure is raised, may be seen and appreciated, I have thought it good here to reprint a portion of Cyprian's letter to Cœcilius, wherein it is elaborately worked out. The estimation in which this letter is held by the party now given to "unprotestantize" the Church of England, is thus expressed by Dr. Pusey, the editor of Cyprian's works, in the Oxford "Library of the Fathers," in the preface to the second volume of Cyprian, No. 17 of the series:—"Of the epistles which are preserved, one, at least, which is chiefly taken up with the sacramental meanings of Holy Scripture, indicates, as well as his 'Testimonies,' a full possession of the system of Scriptural interpretation, which, whether by intuition or by tradition, was the heritage of the ancient Church, as he in his turn aided to fix that meaning. That epistle is like one flash from a mind we love, disclosing to us as it were a new world within it, enlarging and re-arranging all our previous thoughts of it, and deepening our reverence towards it. Of a kind, which will with many command little sympathy now, it shews a reverential contemplation and grasp of the hidden meaning of Holy Scripture in its sacramental aspect, which we must the more admire in one, whose duties, almost from the time of his conversion, were of intense and absorbing activity." It is to be hoped, for the safety and credit of the Church, that the age when such a "grasp of the hidden meaning of Holy Scripture" would be favourably received, is gone for ever. That we should have it, even with interest, if the Oxford Romanists had their way, will be seen by the portion of a note written by the same hand, which follows immediately after the extract from Cyprian:

"Although I am aware, dearest brother, that most of the bishops,

who by the Divine favour are set over the Churches of the Lord throughout the world, adhere to the method of Evangelical truth and the tradition of the Lord, and do not, by human and novel practices, depart from what Christ our master both enjoined and did; yet since some, either through ignorance or simplicity, in consecrating and administrating to the people the cup of the Lord, do not the same as Jesus Christ our Lord and God, the author and teacher of this sacrifice, did and taught; I have thought it a holy and necessary duty to write you this letter, that should any one be still held by this error, he may, having clearly seen the light of truth, return to the root and origin of the tradition of the Lord. Nor must you think, dearest brother, that I am writing my own and human opinions, or that I boldly take this on myself of my own mere will, for that I ever maintain my own mediocrity with humble and shame-faced moderation. But when anything is enjoined by the inspiration and command of God, a faithful servant must needs obey the Lord; acquitted by all of assuming anything arrogantly to himself, in that he is compelled to fear offending the Lord, unless he do what he is bidden. But you should know that I have been admonished, that in offering the cup the tradition of the Lord be observed, nor aught else be done by us, than what the Lord has first done for us: that the cup which is offered 'in remembrance' of Him, should be offered mixed with wine. For whereas Christ says, 'I am the true vine,' (*John* xv., 1;) the blood of Christ is not surely water, but wine. Nor can His blood whereby we have been redeemed and quickened, appear to be in the cup, when the cup is without that wine, whereby the blood of Christ is set forth, as is declared by the mystical meaning and testimony of all the scriptures.

"For we find in Genesis also, as to the hidden mystery in Noah, that this same was promised, and that for them there was a figure of the passion of the Lord, in that he drank wine, (*Gen.* xix., 21); that he was drunken; that he was uncovered within his tent; that he was lying down with his thighs bared and open to view; that such nakedness of the father was noticed by his middle son, and told abroad; but was covered by two, the elder and the younger; and other circumstances which it is not necessary to follow out, since it suffices to embrace this alone, that Noah exhibiting a type of the future truth, did not drink water, but wine, and so pourtrayed a figure of the passion of the Lord.

"Likewise in the priest Melchisedec we see the mystery of the sacrifice of our Lord prefigured, as Holy Scripture testifies, saying, 'And Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine,' (*Gen.* xiv., 18.) But he was 'the priest of the most High God,' and

'blessed Abraham.' But that Melchisedec bore a type of Christ, the Holy Spirit declares in the Psalms, saying to the Son in the Person of the Father, 'Before the morning star I begat Thee; Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec,' (*Ps.* cx., 3, 4.) Which *order* assuredly is this, coming from that sacrifice and thence descending, that Melchisedec was a priest of the most High God, that he offered bread and wine, that he blessed Abraham. For who is more a priest of the most High God, than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered that same which Melchisedec had offered, that is, bread and wine, namely, His own body and blood? And that blessing going before with respect to Abraham, belonged to our people. For if 'Abraham believed in God, and it was counted to him for righteousness,' (Gen. xv., 6;) then whoever believes in God and lives by faith, is found righteous, and is shewn long since to have been blessed and justified in faithful Abraham; as the blessed apostle Paul proves, saying, 'Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Ye know then that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. But the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before to Abraham, that in him all nations should be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham,' (*Gal.* iii., 6—9.) Whence in the Gospel we find, that 'from stones are raised,' that is, from the Gentiles are gathered, 'children unto Abraham,' (*Matt.* iii., 9.) And when the Lord praised Zacchæus, He answered and said, 'This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham,' (*Luke* xix., 9.) In Genesis therefore, that the blessing of Abraham by Melchisedec the priest might be duly celebrated, the figure of the sacrifice of Christ goes before, appointed namely in bread and wine, which thing the Lord accomplishing and fulfilling, offered bread and the cup mixed with wine, and He who is the fulness of truth, fulfilled the truth of the prefigured image.

"Moreover by Solomon, the Holy Spirit, shewing beforehand a type of the sacrifice of the Lord, making mention of the victim slain, and of the bread and wine, yea, also of the altar and of the apostles, saith, 'Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath underlaid her seven pillars; she hath killed her sacrifices; she hath mingled her wine in the cup; she hath also furnished her table. She hath sent forth her servants, calling together, with voice uplifted, to her cup, saying, whoso is simple, let him turn in to me. And to those that want understanding she hath said, come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled for you,' (*Prov.* ix., 1—5.) He sets forth the mingled

wine, that is, he foretells by prophetic voice the cup of the Lord mingled with water and wine; that in the Passion of the Lord that may appear to be done which had been before predicted. In the blessing of Judah also, this same is signified, where a figure of Christ is expressed therein also, that He should be 'praised' by 'His brethren,' and that they should 'bow down before' Him, that He should press on 'the neck of' His 'enemies' yielding and fleeing, with those 'hands' with which He bore the cross and overcame death: that He is 'the lion of the tribe of Judah,' and should 'couch,' sleeping in His passion, and 'rise up' and be the 'hope' of 'the Gentiles.' (See Gen. xlix., 8, 9.) To which Holy Scripture adds and says, 'He shall wash His garments in wine, and His clothes in the blood of grapes,' (*Gen* xlix., 11.) But when the blood of grapes is mentioned, what else is shewn than the wine of the cup of the blood of the Lord? Moreover in Isaiah the Holy Spirit testifies this same of the Passion of the Lord, saying, 'Wherefore art Thou red in Thine apparel, and Thy garments like him that treadeth in a wine-vat?' (*Is.* lxiii., 2.) Can water make apparel red? or is it water in the wine-vat which is trodden by the feet, or squeezed out by the press? Mention is therefore made of wine, that the blood of the Lord may be understood; and what was afterwards manifested in the cup of the Lord, might be foreshewn in the predictions of the prophets. The treading and pressure of the wine-vat is also dwelt upon: because as men cannot come to the drinking of wine unless the cluster be first trodden and pressed, so neither could we drink the blood of Christ, unless Christ had been first trodden on and pressed, and first drank of the cup, in which He should give believers to drink.

"But as often as water alone is mentioned in the sacred Scriptures, baptism is alluded to, as we see is intimated in Isaiah, 'Remember ye not,' he says, 'the former things, neither consider the things of old. Behold, I will do a new thing, which now shall spring forth, and ye shall know it. I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in a dry place; to give drink to My people, My chosen; My people whom I have purchased, that they might shew forth My praise,' (*Is.* xliii., 18—21.) There God by the prophet foretold, that among nations in places which had before been dry, rivers should afterwards flow abundantly, and should water the chosen people of God, that is, those made sons of God by the regeneration of baptism. It is also again proclaimed and foretold, that the Jews, if they should be athirst, and seek after Christ, should drink with us, that is, should attain the grace of baptism. 'If they shall be athirst,' he says, 'He will lead

them through the deserts, water out of the rock will He bring forth for them; the rock shall be cleft, and the waters shall gush out, and My people shall drink.' (*Is.* xlviii., 21.) This is fulfilled in the Gospel, when Christ, who is 'the rock,' is cleft by a stroke of the spear in His passion; who also, admonishing as to what had been before foretold by the prophet, crieth out and says, 'If any man thirst, let him come and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' And that it might be more manifest that the Lord there speaks not of the cup, but of baptism, the Scripture added, 'But this spake He of the spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive.' For by baptism the Holy Spirit is received, and so they that are baptized, and have obtained the Holy Spirit, come to drink of the cup of the Lord. Nor let that move any one, that when Holy Scripture speaks of baptism, it says that we thirst and drink, for that the Lord also in the Gospel says, 'Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness,' (*Matt.* v., 6;) for that which is received by hungry and thirsty longing, is more fully and abundantly imbibed. As also in another place the Lord speaks to the Samaritan woman, saying, 'Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again; but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst.' In which too the baptism of saving water is signified, which in truth is once received, nor ever again repeated.' But the cup of the Lord is both continually thirsted for and drunk in the Church.

"Nor have we need of many arguments, dearest brother, to prove that by the name of water baptism is always signified, and that we ought so to understand it; since the Lord, at His coming, manifested the truth of baptism and of the cup, in that He commanded that the unfailing water, the water of eternal life, be given to believers in baptism; but by the example of His own authority, He taught that the cup should be mingled by the union of wine and water. For taking the cup on the eve of His passion, He blessed it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, 'Drink ye all of this: for this is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom,' (*Mat.* xxvi., 27—29.) Wherein we find that the cup which the Lord offered was mixed, and that that was wine which He called His blood. Whence it is apparent that the blood of Christ is not offered, if there is no wine in the cup; nor the sacrifice of the Lord celebrated by a legitimate consecration, unless our oblation and sacrifice corresponds with His passion. But how shall we drink new wine of the fruit of the vine with Christ in the kingdom of the Father, if in the sacrifice of

God the Father and of Christ, we do not offer wine, nor mingle the cup of the Lord according to the Lord's institution ?

"The blessed Apostle Paul also, chosen and sent by the Lord, and appointed a preacher of the truth of the Gospel, lays down the very same in his Epistle, saying, 'The Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, This is My body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in My blood; this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me: for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come,' (1 *Cor.* xi., 23—26.) If, then, it is both commanded by the Lord, and the same thing is confirmed and delivered by His apostle, that as often as we drink, in remembrance of the Lord, we do the same which the Lord also did, we discover that what was commanded is not observed by us, unless we also do the very same that the Lord did, and mingling the cup of the Lord in like manner, depart not from the Divine authority. But that we must not at all depart from the evangelical precepts, and that the disciples also ought to observe and do the same which their Master taught and did, the blessed apostle elsewhere more urgently and strongly teaches, saying, 'I wonder that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you into grace, unto another Gospel, which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed,' (*Gal.* i., 6—9.) Since, then, neither the apostle himself nor an angel from heaven can preach or teach otherwise than Christ has once taught and His apostles preached, I marvel much whence this practice has arisen, that in some places, contrary to evangelical and apostolic discipline, water is offered in the cup of the Lord, which alone cannot represent the blood of Christ.

"The mystery whereof the Holy Spirit omitteth not in the Psalms also, making mention of the cup of the Lord, and saying, 'Thy inebriating cup, how good is it :'* but the cup that inebriateth must surely be mixed with wine. For water cannot inebriate any one. But the cup of the Lord so inebriateth, as Noah, in Genesis, drinking wine, was inebriated, (*Gen.* ix., 21.) But because the inebriation of the cup and

* Ps. 23, 5. see also S. Ambr. in Ps. 35. s. 19. Ps. 1. s. 33. and in Ps. 118. lit. 13. s. 24. lit. 21. s. 4. S. Hil. in Ps. 64. s. 15. S. Aug. in Ps. 35. s. 14. Ps. 103. Enarr. 3. s. 13. Theodoret in Ps. 22, 5.

blood of the Lord is not such as the inebriation of this world's wine, when the Holy Spirit said in the Psalm, 'Thy inebriating cup,' He added, 'how good is it;' because in truth the cup of the Lord so inebriates them that drink it as to make them sober, as to bring back their minds to spiritual wisdom, so that each should recover from this world's savour to the perception of God: and as by that common wine the mind is dissolved, and the soul relaxed, and all sadness laid aside, so when the blood of the Lord and the saving cup hath been drunk, the memory of the old man is laid aside, and there cometh a forgetfulness of his 'former conversation in the world,' and the sad and mournful breast, which before was oppressed with the choking sense of sins, is set free by the joy of Divine forgiveness; which then only can gladden him who drinks it in the Church of the Lord, if what is drunken retains the truth of the Lord.

"But how perverse is it, and how wilful, when the Lord at the marriage-feast made of water wine (*John* ii., 9), for us to make of wine, water; when too that mystery ought to admonish and instruct us, that in the sacrifices of the Lord we should rather offer wine! For because among the Jews spiritual grace had failed, wine also failed: 'For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts was the house of Israel,' (*Is.* v., 7;) but Christ, teaching and shewing that the Gentiles succeeded them, and that we afterwards, by the merit of faith, should attain to that place which the Jews had lost, made of water wine, that is, He shewed that, the Jews failing, the people of the Gentiles should the more flow in and meet together at the nuptials of Christ and His Church. For that waters signify peoples, Holy Scripture declares in the Revelations, saying, 'The waters which thou sawest, on which the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.' (*Rev.* xvii., 15.)

"This, too, we perceive, is contained in the mystery of the cup. For because Christ loves us all, in that He bore our sins also, we see that in the water the people are intended, but that in the wine is shewn the blood of Christ. But when in the cup water is mingled with wine, His people are united to Christ, and the multitude of believers are united and conjoined with Him in whom they believe; which union and conjunction of water and wine is so mingled together in the cup of the Lord, that that commixture cannot again be separated. Whence neither can the Church, that is, the people settled in the Church, faithfully and stedfastly persevering in what they have believed, be by aught separated from Christ, that its indissoluble affection should not ever adhere and abide with Him. Thus, then, in consecrating the cup of the Lord, water alone cannot be offered, as neither can wine alone. For if any

should offer wine alone, this is as though the blood of Christ were without us; but if there be water alone, the people begin to be without Christ. But when both are mingled, and by an infused union each is joined with the other, then the spiritual and heavenly sacrament is perfected. Thus, then, the cup of the Lord is not water alone, or wine alone, unless both are mingled together, as also the body of the Lord cannot be meat alone, or water alone, unless both be united and joined together, and compacted into one cohering bread. In which mystery also our people are shewn to be united, so that as many grains* collected, and ground, and mingled together make one bread; so in Christ, who is the heavenly bread, we may know that there is one body, wherewith our whole number is conjoined and united."

The note of Dr. Pusey, previously alluded to, is as follows:—"Formerly the faithful used a somewhat larger loaf in the Eucharist, that all who partook of it might be shewn to be 'one bread,' and to be made partakers of the communion of the broken body of the Lord. Then it became the practice to use wafers, but the mystical meaning is not lost; for they represent the pieces of silver, the price of the body of the Lord. In this same epistle, St. Chrysostom relates that the Holy Eucharist was at first celebrated by the Lord at night, nor was this without a mystery (sec. 13); but he subjoins, 'but we in the morning celebrate the Resurrection of the Lord;' whence also that will appear, that 'we wish to walk in the light of Christ.' Again, by the decree of Eugenius, the Roman pontiff, it is ordained that water be mingled with the cup to be consecrated, in 'small quantity;' and so, by the superabundance of the wine above the quality of the water, is signified the superabundance of the merits of Christ our Lord and His dignity above the human nature and the sins of the human race. Yet not less suitably by the use of wine alone is it shewn that we are saved by the merits of Christ alone, and by His blood. In like way the Greeks pour warm water into the consecrated cup, to signify (as Balsamon explains in Can. 32, Conc. Trull.) 'that what flowed from the holy side of our Lord Jesus Christ are life-giving.' The Latins use cold water, in witness that Christ really died, and that we are saved only by His death. In like manner, in Baptism: formerly trine immersion was required, as significant of the Trinity; then single followed, that we might profess that we acknowledge one God. [In the Spanish Church, see Bingham, 11. 11. 8.] Immersion also seemed necessary, that we might seem to be buried with Christ in baptism; now we are sprinkled with water, that we may be seen to be cleansed by the sprinkling of His blood."

* Eph. lxix., ad Magn. s. 4.

APPENDIX F.

The idea which Augustine had of the acceptable sacrifices under the Gospel dispensation, and the connection which these had with those under the law, is clearly seen by the following extracts of his "De Civitate Dei," lib. x. c. 5, 6:

"But who is so fond to think that God needeth anything that is offered in sacrifice? The Scripture condemns them that think so, diversely. One place of the Psalmist (to make short) for all: 'I said unto the Lord, Thou art my God, because Thou needest none of my goods,' (*Psal.* xvi., 2.) Believe it, therefore, God had no need of man's cattle, nor any earthly good of his, no, not his justice; but all the worship that he giveth God is for his own profit, not God's. One cannot say he doth the fountain good by drinking of it, or the light by seeing by it. Nor had the patriarchs' ancient sacrifices (which now God's people read of, but use not) any other intent but to signify what should be done of us in our love to God, and charity to our neighbour for the same end. So, then, an external offering is a visible sacrament of an invisible sacrifice, that is, a holy sign. And thereupon the penitent man in the prophet (or, rather, the penitent prophet), desiring God to pardon his sins, 'Thou desirest no sacrifice though I would give it,' saith he, 'but Thou delightest not in burnt-offerings: the sacrifices of God are a contrite spirit; a broken and humbled heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise,' (*Psal.* li., 16, 17.) Behold, here he saith, God will have sacrifices, and God will have no sacrifices. He will have no slaughtered beast, but He will have a contrite heart. So in that which He denied was implied that which He desired. The prophet, then, saying He will not have such, why do fools think He will, as delighting in them? If He would not have had such sacrifices as He desired (whereof a contrite heart is one) to have been signified in those

other (wherein they thought He delighted), He would not have given any command concerning them in Leviticus. But there are set times appointed for their changes, lest men should think He took pleasure in them, or accepted them of us otherwise than as signs of the other. Therefore, saith another psalm, 'If I be hungry I will not tell thee, for all the world is mine, and all that therein is. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?' (*Psal.* l., 12, 13.) As who should say, if I would I would not beg them of thee, having them in my power. But then addeth he their signification: 'Offer praise to God, and pay thy vows to the Most High; and call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee) and thou shalt glorify me,' (*Psal.* l., 14, 15.) And in another prophet: 'Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the High God? Shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, and with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousand rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, even the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good, and what the Lord requireth of thee: surely to do justice, and to love mercy, and to humble thyself to walk with thy God,' (*Mic.* vi., 6, 7, 8.) In these words are both the sacrifices plainly distinct; and it is shewn that God respecteth not the first that signify those He respecteth, as the epistle, intituled to the Hebrews, saith: 'To do good and distribute forget not, for with such sacrifices God is pleased,' (*Heb.* xiii., 16.) And, as it is elsewhere, 'I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.' This sheweth that the external sacrifice is but a type of the better, and that which men call a sacrifice is the sign of the true one. And mercy is a true sacrifice; whereupon it is said, as before, 'With such sacrifices God is pleased.' Wherefore all the precepts concerning sacrifices in the tabernacle and the temple have all reference to the love of God and our neighbour; for in these two, as is said, is contained all the law and the prophets.

"Every work, therefore, tending to effect our beatitude by a holy conjunction with God, is a true sacrifice. Compassion shewn upon a man, and not for God's sake, is no sacrifice. For a sacrifice (though offered by a man) is a divine thing, and so the ancient Latinists term it; whereupon a man, consecrated wholly to God's name, to live to Him and die to the world, is a sacrifice; for this is mercy shewn upon himself; and so it is written, 'Pity thine own soul, and please God,' (*Eccl.* xxx., 23.) And when we chastise our body by abstinence, if we do it as we should, not making our members instruments of iniquity, but of God's justice, it is a sacrifice, whereunto the apostle exhorts us,

saying, 'I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you give up your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable serving of God,' (*Rom.* xii., 1.) If, therefore, the body, being but servant and instrument unto the soul, being rightly used in God's service, be a sacrifice, how much more is the soul one when it relieth upon God, and, being inflamed with His love, loseth all form of temporal concupiscence, and is framed according to His most excellent figure, pleasing Him by participating of His beauty? This the apostle adjoins in these words: 'And fashion not yourselves like this world, but be ye changed in newness of heart, that ye may prove what is the good will of God, and what is good, acceptable, and perfect,' (*Rom.* xii., 3.) Wherefore, seeing the works of mercy being referred unto God, be they done to ourselves or our neighbours, are true sacrifices, and that their end is nothing but to free us from misery and make us happy by that God, and none other, of whom it is said, 'It is good for me to adhere unto the Lord,' (*Psal.* lxxiii., 23;) truly it followeth, that all the whole and holy society of the redeemed and sanctified city be offered unto God, by that Great Priest who gave up His life for us, to make us members of so great a head in so mean a form. This form He offered, and herein was He offered; in this He, our Priest, our Mediator, and Sacrifice, all in this. Now, therefore, the apostle, having exhorted us to give up our bodies a living sacrifice, pure and acceptable to God,—namely, our reasonable serving of God,—and not to fashion ourselves like this world, but be changed in newness of heart, that we might prove what is the will of God, and what is good, acceptable, and perfect, all which sacrifice we are: 'For I say,' quoth he, 'through the grace that is given to me, to every one among you, that no man presume to understand more than is meet to understand; but that he understand according to sobriety, as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith. For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not one office; so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one one another's members, having divers gifts according to the grace that is given us, &c.' This is the Christian's sacrifice. We are one body with Christ, as the Church celebrateth in the sacrament of the altar, so well known to the faithful, wherein is shewed that in that oblation the Church is offered."

APPENDIX G.

ST. JUSTIN MARTYR'S ACCOUNT

OF THE MANNER OF CELEBRATING THE EUCHARIST IN HIS DAYS, THAT IS, ABOUT FIFTY YEARS AFTER THE DEATH OF ST. JOHN THE APOSTLE, BEGINNING AT THE EIGHTY-FIFTH CHAPTER OF HIS FIRST APOLOGY.

After the believer is baptized, and so incorporated or made one with us, we lead him to the congregation of the brethren, as we call them, and then with great fervency pour out our souls in common prayers, both for ourselves, for the person baptized, and for all others all the world over; that, having embraced the truth, our conversation might be as becometh the Gospel, and that we may be found doers of the word, and so at length be saved with an everlasting salvation. Prayers being over, we salute each other with a kiss: after this, bread and a cup of wine and water are brought to the president or bishop, which he takes, and offers up praise and glory to the Father of all things, through the name of His Son and the Holy Spirit; and this thanksgiving to God, for vouchsafing us worthy of these His creatures, is a prayer of more than ordinary length. When the bishop has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving service, all the people present conclude with an audible voice, saying, *Amen.* Now *Amen,* in the Hebrew tongue, is, *so be it.* The Eucharistical office, being thus performed by the bishop, and concluded with the acclamation of all the people, those we call deacons distribute to every one present to partake of this Eucharistic bread, and wine, and water, and then they carry it to the absent.

The food we call the Eucharist, of which none are allowed to be partakers, but such only as are true believers, and have been baptized

in the laver of regeneration for the remission of sins, and live according to Christ's precepts; for we do not take this as common bread and common wine. But as Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh by the Logos of God, and had real flesh and blood for our salvation, so are we taught that this food, which the very same Logos blessed by prayer and thanksgiving, is turned into the nourishment and substance of our flesh and blood, and is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus. For the apostles, in their commentaries called the Gospels, have left this command upon record, 'That Jesus took bread, and when he had given thanks, he said, Do this in commemoration of me, for this is my body: and in like manner he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, this is my blood,'* and delivered it to them only. And this very solemnity, too, the evil spirits have introduced into the 'Mysteries of Mithra;' for you do or may know, that when any one is initiated into this religion, bread and a cup of water, with a certain form of words are made use of in the sacrifice. After this sacrament is over, we remind each other of the obligations to his duty, and the rich relieve the poor, and upon such charitable accounts we visit some or other every day.

And in every Eucharistical sacrifice we bless the Maker of all things, through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit: and upon the day called Sunday, all that live either in city or country meet together at the same place, where the writings of the apostles and prophets are read, as much as time will give leave; when the reader has done, the bishop makes a sermon to the people, and animates them to the practice of such lovely precepts. At the conclusion of this discourse, we all rise up together and pray; and, prayers being over, as I now said, there is bread, and wine, and water offered, and the bishop as before, sends up prayers and thanksgivings, with all the fervency he is able, and the people conclude all with the joyful acclamation of *Amen*. Then the consecrated elements are distributed to, and partaken of by all that are present, and sent to the absent by the hands of the deacons." *From Mr. Reeves' Translation of Justin, London,* 1709.

* Matt. xxvi., 26; Mark xiv., 22; Luke xxii., 19, etc.

(APPENDIX G. *continued.*)

THE

CLEMENTINE LITURGY,

AS IT STANDS IN THE BOOK CALLED THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS, BOOK VIII., CHAPTER 12.

The Deacon shall say,

Let none of the Catechumens, none of the hearers, none of the unbelievers, none of the heterodox stay. You who have prayed the former prayer, depart. Mothers, take up your children. Let no one have ought against any man. Let us stand upright, to present unto the Lord our offerings with fear and trembling.

¶ *When this is done, let the deacons bring the gifts to the bishop at the altar; and let the priests stand on his right hand, and on his left, as disciples by their Master. But let two of the deacons, on each side of the altar, hold a fan made up of thin membranes, or peacock's feathers, or fine cloth; and let them silently drive away flies and gnats, that they may not fall into the cups. Then the bishop, after having prayed secretly (and likewise the priests), and having put on his splendid vestment, and standing at the altar, and signing himself with the sign of the cross upon his forehead, let him say,*

The grace of Almighty God, and the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.

And let all with one voice say,

And with thy Spirit.

Bishop. Lift up your mind.

People. We lift it up unto the Lord.

Bishop. Let us give thanks to the Lord.

People. It is meet and right so to do.

Bishop. It is indeed meet and right to sing praises to thee, the true God, from everlasting, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named; who alone art unbegotten, without beginning, the supreme Lord, Almighty King, and self-sufficient; the author and giver of all good things, without cause, without generation, self-existing; the same yesterday, to day, and for ever. At Thy word, as from a

necessary original, all things started into being. For Thou art everlasting knowledge, sight before all objects, hearing before all sounds, wisdom without instruction; the first in nature, the fountain of being, the eternal one, exceeding all number, incomprehensible. Thou createdst all things out of nothing by Thine only begotten Son, begotten before all ages by no other means than Thy will, Thy power, and Thy goodness; God the word, the living wisdom, the first-born of every creature, the angel of Thy great counsel, Thy High Priest, but the Lord and King of all sensible and intellectual creatures, who was before all things, and by whom all things were made. Thou, O eternal God, didst make all things by Him, and by Him too dispensest Thy providence over them; for by the same that Thou broughtest all things into being, by Him thou continuest all things in well-being. The God and Father of Thine only begotten Son; who by Him didst make first the cherubim and seraphim, the ages, and all the heavenly hosts, the principalities and powers, thrones and dominions, angels and archangels, and after these didst by Him create this visible world, and all things which are therein. For it is Thou who hast fixed the heaven like an arch, and stretched it out like the covering of a tent; who hast laid the foundation of the earth, which resteth upon nothing but Thy will; who hast established the firmament, and prepared the night and the day, bringing light out of Thy treasures, and darkness to overshadow it, that under its covert the living creatures of this world might take their repose. Thou hast appointed the sun to rule the day, and the moon to govern the night; and moreover, hast imprinted in the heavens a choir of stars for the honour of Thy glorious Majesty. Thou hast made water for drink, and for cleansing, the vital air for respiration, and conveyance of sounds by the tongue's striking of it, and the hearing which co-operates with it, so as to perceive the voice when it is received by it, and falls upon it. Thou madest fire for our consolation in darkness, and for the relief of our necessities, that we might be both warmed and enlightened by it. Thou didst divide the sea from the land, making the one navigable, and the other a basis for our feet in walking; the former Thou hast replenished with small and great beasts, the latter, too, both with tame and wild; and hast, moreover, furnished it with various plants, crowned it with herbs, beautified it with flowers, and enriched it with seeds. Thou hast collected together the great deep, and cast a mound about it; seas of salt waters stand as an heap bounded on every side with barriers of sand; sometimes Thou dost swell it by the wind, so as to equal the high mountains, and sometimes smooth it into a plain; now making it rage with a tempest, then stilling it with a calm,

for the ease of mariners in their voyages. The earth, which was made by Thee through Christ, Thou hast encompassed with rivers, watered with currents, and moistened with springs which never fail; Thou hast girt it about with mountains, that it may not be moved at any time; Thou hast replenished and adorned it with fragrant and medicinal herbs, with many and various kinds of living creatures, strong and weak, for food and for labour, tame and wild; with the dull harsh noises of those creatures which move upon the earth, and the soft sprightly notes of the gaudy many-coloured birds which wing the air; with the revolution of years, the number of months and days, the regular succession of the seasons; with the courses of the clouds big with rain, for the production of fruits, the support of living creatures; where also the winds take their stand, which blow at Thy command, and for the refreshment of trees and plants. And Thou hast not only created the world, but man likewise the citizen of it; manifesting in him the beauty and excellency of that beautiful and excellent creation. For Thou saidst to Thine own wisdom, Let us make man in Our own image, and after Our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air. Wherefore Thou madest him of an immortal soul, and mortal body; the soul out of nothing, the body out of the four elements; this endued with five senses, and a power of motion; that with reason, and a faculty of distinguishing between religion and irreligion, just and unjust. Thou, O Almighty God, didst also by Thy Christ, plant a garden eastward in Eden, adorned with every plant that was fit for food; into this Thou didst put him, a rich and magnificent habitation; having given him a law in his nature, and such powers that without the assistance of other means, even in himself he might have the principles of Divine knowledge. And when Thou didst put him into this paradise of pleasure, Thou gavest him the privilege of enjoying all its delights, with this only exception, that he should not, out of vain curiosity, in hopes of bettering his condition, taste of one tree, and immortality was to be the reward of his obedience to this command; but when he had broken through it, and eaten of the forbidden fruit, overreached by the subtilty of the serpent, and the counsel of the woman, Thou didst justly drive him out of paradise; but in Thy goodness didst not despise him, nor suffer him utterly to perish; for he was the work of Thine own hands: but Thou gavest him dominion over all things, and by his labour, and the sweat of his face, to procure his food, Thy providence co-operating with him, so as to make the fruits of the earth to spring up, increase, and ripen. And, having subjected him for a while to a temporary death, Thou didst bind thyself by an oath to

restore him to life again; loosing the bands of that death, by the promise of a resurrection to the life which is eternal. Nor was this all; but Thou didst likewise multiply his posterity without number, glorifying as many of them as were obedient unto Thee, and punishing those who rebelled against Thee. Thou didst accept the sacrifice of Abel upon account of his righteousness, and reject the offering of Cain, who slew his brother, because of his unworthiness. And besides these, Thou didst receive Seth and Enos, and translate Enoch. For Thou art the creator of men, the author of life, the supplier of our wants, the giver of laws, the rewarder of those who keep them, and the avenger of those who transgress them. Who didst bring a flood upon the world because of the multitude of the ungodly, but didst deliver righteous Noah from it with eight souls in the ark, the last of the foregoing, and the first of the succeeding generations. Who didst kindle a dreadful fire in the five cities of Sodom, and turn a fruitful land into a salt lake for the wickedness of them that dwelt therein; but didst snatch holy Lot out of the conflagration. Thou art He, who didst preserve Abraham from the idolatry of his forefathers, and appoint him the heir of the world, manifesting unto him Thy Christ. Who didst ordain Melchisedec an high priest for Thy worship. Who didst approve Thy servant Job by his patience and long-suffering, the conquerer of that serpent, who is the author and promoter of all wickedness. Who madest Isaac the son of the promise, and Jacob the father of twelve sons, whom Thou didst multiply exceedingly, bringing him into Egypt with seventy-five souls. Thou, O Lord, didst not overlook Joseph, but gavest him as the reward of his chastity for Thy sake, the government over the Egyptians. Neither didst Thou, O Lord, overlook the Hebrews when in bondage under the Egyptians, but according to Thy promises made to their fathers, Thou didst deliver them, and punish the Egyptians. And when men had corrupted the law of nature, and esteemed the creation, sometimes the effect of chance, and sometimes to be worthy of honour equal to Thine, who art the God of all, Thou didst not suffer them to wander in error; but didst raise up Thy holy servant Moses, and by him give a written law to strengthen the law of nature, and shew the creation to be Thy work, and that there were no other Gods besides Thee. Thou didst adorn Aaron and his posterity with the honour of the priesthood. Thou didst punish the Hebrews when they sinned, and receive them again when they returned to Thee. This didst torment the Egyptians with ten plagues, and divide the sea for the Israelites to pass through, overwhelming the Egyptians in their pursuit after them with the waves thereof. Thou didst sweeten the

bitter water with wood, and bring water out of the rock of stone. Thou didst rain manna from heaven, and quails out of the air for food. Thou madest a pillar of fire to give them light in the night, and a pillar of a cloud to shadow them from the heat in the day. Thou didst raise up Joshua to be general of their armies, and by him destroy seven nations of the Canaanites. Thou didst divide Jordan, and dry up the rivers of Etham. Thou didst overthrow walls without battering rams, or any assistance of human force. For all these things, glory be to Thee, O Lord Almighty; Thee the innumerable hosts of angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, powers, Thine everlasting armies adore. The cherubim and seraphim with six wings, with twain they cover their feet, with twain their heads, and with twain they fly, and say, together with thousand thousands of archangels, and ten thousand times ten thousand of angels, crying incessantly with uninterrupted shouts of praise; and let all the people say with them,

Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of His glory. Blessed be He for evermore. *Amen.*

After this, let the Bishop say,

Thou art indeed holy, and most holy; the highest, and most highly exalted for ever. Holy is also Thine only begotten Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and God. Who always ministering to Thee, his God and Father, not only in the various works of the creation, but in the providential care of it, did not overlook lost mankind. But after the law of nature, the admonitions of the positive law, the prophetical reproofs, and the superintendency of angels, when men had perverted both the positive and natural law, and had forgotten the flood, the burning of Sodom, the plagues of the Egyptians, the slaughter of the Philistines, and were now ready to perish universally; He, who was man's creator, was pleased with Thy consent to become man; the priest to be himself the sacrifice; the shepherd a sheep, to appease Thee, his God and Father, to reconcile thee to the world, and deliver all men from the impending wrath. He was incarnate of a virgin, God the word, the beloved Son, the first-born of every creature; and, as He Himself had foretold by the mouth of the prophets, of the seed of David, and of Abraham, and of the tribe of Juda. He, who forms all that are born in the world, was Himself formed in the womb of a virgin, became flesh; and He who was begotten from eternity, was born in time. He was holy in His conversation, and taught according to the law; He cured diseases, and wrought signs and wonders amongst the people;

He, who is the feeder of the hungry, and fills every living creature with His goodness, became partaker of His own gifts, and eat, and drank, and slept amongst us; He manifested thy name to them that knew it not; He dispelled the cloud of ignorance, restored piety, fulfilled Thy will, and finished Thy work which Thou gavest Him to do. And when He had regulated all these things, He was seized by the hands of a disobedient people, and wicked men abusing the office of priests and high-priests, being betrayed to them by one who excelled in wickedness; and when He had suffered many things from them, and been treated with all manner of indignity, He was by Thy permission delivered to Pilate the governor; the Judge of all the world was judged, and the Saviour of mankind condemned; although impassible, He was nailed to the cross; and although immortal, died. The giver of life was laid in the grave, that He might deliver those from the pains of death, for whose sake He came; and that He might break the bands of the devil, and rescue mankind from his deceit. He arose from the dead the third day; and after continuing forty days with His disciples, He was taken up into heaven, and is set down on the right hand of Thee, His God and Father.

Calling, therefore, to remembrance, those things which He endured for our sakes, we give thanks unto Thee, O God Almighty, not as we ought, but as we are able, to fulfil His institution. For in the same night that He was betrayed, taking bread into His holy and immaculate hands, and looking up to Thee, His God and Father, and breaking it, he gave it to His disciples, saying, This is the mystery of the New Testament; take of it—eat; this is My body, which is broken for many for the remission of sins. Likewise also having mingled the cup with wine and water, and blessed it, He gave it to them, saying, This is My blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; do this in remembrance of Me; for as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do shew forth My death till I come.

Wherefore, having in remembrance His passion, death, and resurrection from the dead, His return into heaven, and His future second appearance, when He shall come with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works; we offer to Thee, our King and our God, according to this institution, this bread and this cup; giving thanks to Thee through Him, that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee, and to sacrifice unto Thee. And we beseech Thee, that Thou wilt look graciously on these gifts now lying before Thee, O thou self-sufficient God; and accept them to the honour of thy Christ. And send down

Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, on this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the body of thy Christ, and this cup the blood of thy Christ. That all who shall partake of it, may be confirmed in godliness, may receive remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his wiles, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of Thy Christ, and may obtain everlasting life; Thou, O Lord Almighty, being reconciled to them.

We farther pray unto Thee, O Lord, for Thy holy Church, spread from one end of the world unto the other, which Thou hast purchased by the precious blood of Thy Christ, that Thou wilt keep it stedfast and immoveable unto the end of the world; and for every episcopate rightly dividing the word of truth. Farther we call upon Thee for my unworthiness, who am now offering; and for the whole presbytery; for the deacons, and all the clergy; that Thou wouldst endue them with wisdom, and fill them with the Holy Ghost. Farther, we call upon Thee, O Lord, for the king and all that are in authority, for the success of the army, that they may be kindly disposed towards us; that leading our whole life in peace and quietness, we may glorify Thee through Jesus Christ our hope. Farther, we offer to Thee for all the saints, who have pleased Thee from the beginning of the world; the patriarchs, prophets, righteous men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose names Thou knowest. We farther offer to Thee for this people; that for the glory of Thy Christ Thou wilt render them a royal priesthood, an holy nation; for the virgins, and all that live chastely; for the widows of the Church; for those that live in honourable marriage, and child bearing; for the young ones among Thy people; that Thou wilt not permit any of us to become cast-aways. Farther, we pray unto Thee for this city, and the inhabitants thereof; for the sick; for those that are in slavery; for those that are in banishment; for those that are in prison; for those that travel by land or by water; that Thou wilt be to all of them an helper, strengthener, and supporter.

We farther beseech Thee also for those who hate us, and persecute us for Thy name's sake; for those that are without, and wander in error; that Thou wouldst convert them to that which is good, and appease their wrath against us. Farther, we pray unto Thee for the catechumens of the Church; for those who are under possession, and for those our brethren who are in the state of penance: that Thou wilt perfect the first in Thy faith, deliver the second from the power of the wicked one, accept the repentance of the last, and grant unto them and to us the remission of our sins. Farther, we offer unto Thee for season-

able weather, and that we may have plenty of the fruits of the earth; that receiving the abundance of Thy good things, we may incessantly praise Thee who givest food to all flesh. Farther, we pray unto Thee for all those who are absent upon a just cause; that Thou wilt preserve all of us in godliness, and gather us together in the kingdom of Thy Christ our King, the God of every sensible and intelligent being. And that Thou wilt keep us stedfast, unblamable, and unreprovable. For to Thee is due all glory, adoration, and thanksgiving, honour and worship to the Father, and to the Holy Ghost, both now and ever, and world without end.

¶ *And let all the people say,* Amen.

¶ *And let the Bishop say,* The peace of God be with you all.

¶ *And let all the people say,* And with Thy Spirit.

¶ *And let the Deacon again proclaim,*

Let us farther pray to God through His Christ, in behalf of the gift that is offered to the Lord God; that the good God will receive it through the mediation of His Christ at His heavenly altar for a sweet-smelling savour. Let us pray for this Church and people. Let us pray for every episcopate, for the whole presbytery, for all the deacons and ministers in Christ, for the whole congregation; that the Lord will preserve and keep them all. Let us pray for kings and all that are in authority, that they may be peaceable towards us; so that enjoying a quiet and peaceable life, we may spend our days in all godliness and honesty. Let us commemorate the holy martyrs, that we may be deemed worthy to be partakers of their trial. Let us pray for all those who have died in the faith. Let us pray for the good condition of the air, and the ripening of the fruits. Let us pray for those that are newly baptized, that they may be confirmed in the faith, that all may be mutually comforted by one another. Raise us up, O God, by Thy grace; and being raised up, let us devote ourselves to God through Jesus Christ.

¶ *And let the Bishop say,*

O God, who art great, great in name and counsel, powerful in Thy works, the God and Father of Thy holy Son Jesus Christ our Saviour, look upon us and upon this Thy flock, which Thou hast chosen through Him to the glory of Thy name; sanctify us in body and soul; and grant that we, being purified from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, may

partake of the mystic blessings now lying before Thee, and judge none of us unworthy of them, but be Thou our supporter, our helper, and defender, through Thy Christ, with whom glory, honour, laud, praise, and thanksgiving be to Thee and the Holy Ghost for ever. *Amen.*

¶ *And after all have said,* Amen, *let the Deacon say,*

Let us attend;

¶ *And the Bishop shall speak aloud to the people in this manner:*

Holy things are for holy persons.

And let the people answer: There is one Holy, one Lord, one Jesus Christ to the glory of God the Father, blessed for evermore. *Amen.* Glory be to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men. Hosanna to the Son of David. Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord; He is our God and Lord, and hath appeared to us. Hosanna in the highest.

¶ *After this, let the bishop receive, then the presbyters, and deacons, and subdeacons, and readers, and singers, and ascetics, and of the women the deaconesses, virgins, and widows. Afterwards the children, and then all the people in order, with fear and reverence, without tumult or noise. And the bishop shall give the oblation, saying,*

The body of Christ.

¶ *And let him that receives say,* Amen.

¶ *And the Deacon shall hold the cup, and when he gives it, let him say,*

The blood of Christ, the cup of life.

¶ *And let him that drinks say,* Amen.

APPENDIX H.

The great importance of Augustine's opinions in by-gone days (and the really sound and evangelical manner in which he generally expounded Scripture entitled him to great consideration), will apologise for giving so long an extract from his 'Commentary on the Sixth Chapter of St. John's Gospel.' It will be found, *wholly* and *unmistakably*, at variance with the ideas for which it has been so often quoted in support:

"'I am,' saith He, 'the bread of life.' And what were they proud of? 'Your fathers,' He saith, 'ate manna in the wilderness, and died.' What is it ye are proud of? 'They ate manna and died,' Why ate and died? Because what they saw, they believed; what they saw not, they did not understand, 'Your fathers,' in this, that ye are like them. For, my brethren, so far as it regards this visible and corporal death, do not we die who eat the bread that cometh down from heaven? They died just as we must die, in regard, as I said, of the visible and carnal death of this body. But, as it regards that death from which the Lord deterreth us, the death by which their fathers died, Moses too ate manna, Aaron ate manna, Phinehas ate manna, many ate there, who pleased the Lord, and died not. Why? Because that visible food they spiritually understood, spiritually hungered after, spiritually tasted, that they might spiritually be filled. For we too at this day do receive visible food; but the sacrament is one, the virtue of the sacrament another. How many receive from the altar and die; yea, by receiving, die! Whence the apostle saith, 'Eateth and drinketh judgment to himself.' It was not that the sop of the Lord was poison to Judas. And yet he received, and when he received, the enemy entered into him: not that he received an evil thing, but that he, being evil, did in evil wise receive what was good. Look to it, then, brethren; eat ye spiritually the heavenly bread; bring innocence to the altar. Your sins, though they be daily, at least let them not be deadly. Before ye approach the altar, mark well what ye say; 'Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors.' Thou forgivest, thou shalt be

forgiven: approach without fear: it is bread, not poison. But look to it whether thou forgive; for if thou forgive not, thou liest, and liest to Him whom thou canst not deceive. Thou canst lie to God; but deceive God, thou canst not. He knoweth what He doeth. Within He seeth thee, within He doth examine thee, within He inspecteth, within judgeth, within either condemneth or crowneth. But the fathers of these men: that means, evil fathers of evil sons, unbelieving fathers of unbelieving, murmuring fathers of murmurers. For by nothing is that people said to have more offended the Lord, than by murmuring against God. Accordingly the Lord, as He would shew that they were sons of such as themselves, began with this in speaking to them: 'Why murmur ye among yourselves,' ye murmurers, sons of murmurers? 'Your fathers ate manna in the wilderness, and died:' not that the manna was evil, but that they in evil wise did eat it.

" 'This is the bread which cometh down from heaven.' This bread the manna signified; this bread the altar of God doth signify. Those were sacraments: in signs they are diverse, in the thing signified they are alike. Hear the apostle: 'For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat.' Meaning, of course, that as 'spiritual' it was the same; for as corporal it was another, because they ate manna, we something else; the spiritual meat, however, that which we eat. But it is, 'our fathers,' not their fathers: they to whom we are like, not to whom they were like. And he adds: 'And did all drink the same spiritual drink.' They, one thing; we, another; but other only in the visible object, which, however, should signify this same thing in its spiritual virtue. For how was it 'the same drink? They drank,' saith he, 'of the spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ.' Thence the bread, thence the drink. The rock, Christ in a sign: the true Christ, in the word and in the flesh. And how drank they? The rock was smitten with a rod, twice: the double smiting signifies the two beams of the cross. 'This,' then, 'is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that whoso eateth thereof may not die.' But this, in regard of the virtue of the sacrament, not in regard of the visible sacrament: he that eateth inwardly, not outwardly: he that eateth in the heart, not he that presseth with his teeth.

" 'I am the living bread, who am come down from heaven.' Therefore 'living,' because 'I came down from heaven.' From heaven came also the manna: yea, but the manna was a shadow, this is the verity. 'If any shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the

bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.' When should flesh receive this, that he called bread flesh? That is called flesh, which flesh receiveth not; yea, for this cause all the more the flesh receiveth it not, because it is called flesh. For at this they had horror; this they said was too much for them; this they thought impossible to be. 'Is my flesh,' saith He, 'for the life of the world.' The faithful know the body of Christ, if they neglect not to be the body of Christ. Let them become the body of Christ, if they wish to live by the spirit of Christ. By the spirit of Christ liveth not any, but the body of Christ. Understand, my brethren, what I would say. Thou art man: both spirit thou hast, and body thou hast. By 'spirit' I mean what is called the soul, in which it consisteth that thou art man: for thou consistest of soul and body. Thou hast, then, a spirit invisible, a body visible. Tell me, whether liveth by other? Doth thy soul live of thy body, or thy body live of thy spirit? Every man that liveth maketh answer; and he who cannot make this answer, I know not whether he liveth: and what answereth every man that liveth? 'My body, of course, lives by my spirit.' Then wouldst thou also live by the spirit of Christ? Be thou in the body of Christ. For, doth my body live by thy spirit? Mine liveth by my spirit, and thine by thine. The body of Christ cannot live but by the spirit of Christ. Thence it is that the Apostle Paul, expounding to us this bread, saith, 'One bread, one body are we, being many.' O sacrament of piety! O sign of unity! O bond of charity! Whoso would live, hath where to live, hath whereof to live. Let him come, let him believe: let him be incorporated, that he may be quickened. Let him not shrink from the whole into which the members are compacted together; let him not be a rotten member, to deserve to be cut off; not be a distorted member, to be ashamed of: let him be a beautiful, let him be a well-fitting, let him be a sound member; let him cleave to the body, let him live to God by God; let him now labour on earth, that thereafter he may reign in heaven.

"'The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us His flesh to eat?' They strove, of course, among themselves, because the bread of concord they understood not, nor wished to take: for they that eat such bread, strive not among themselves, since 'we, being many, are one bread, one body.' And by this, 'the Lord maketh men of one sort to dwell in an house.'

"That, however, which, striving among themselves, they ask, namely, how the Lord can give men His flesh to eat, they do not straightway hear: but they are still told, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood,

ye will not have life in you.' How indeed it may be eaten, and what is the way of feeding upon this bread, ye know not: nevertheless, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye will not have life in you.' These words He spake, not, of course, to dead corpses, but to living men. Whence, lest, understanding this present life, they should also strive concerning this matter, He proceeded to say, 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.' This, therefore, hath that man not, who eateth not this bread, nor drinketh this blood: for temporal life without Him men may have, but eternal they can in no wise have. Who, then, eateth not His flesh, nor drinketh His blood, hath not life in him: and who eateth His flesh, and drinketh His blood, hath life. It answereth, however, to both, that He said 'eternal.' Not so is it in this meat, which we take for sustenance of this temporal life. For if one take it not, he will not live: yet if one take it, he will not therefore live. For it may be, that, of old age, or some disease, or some casualty, very many who do take it shall die. But in this true meat and drink, that is, the body and blood of Christ, it is not so. For, both he that taketh it not hath not life, and he that taketh it hath life, and that, of course, eternal. By this meat and drink, then, He would have to be understood the fellowship of His body and members, which is the holy Church, in His predestinated, and called, and justified, and glorified, and believing ones. Of which, the first hath already taken place—that is, predestination; the second and third hath taken place, and is taking place, and shall take place—that is, calling and justification: but the fourth is now in hope, while in the reality it is future—that is, glorifying. The sacrament of this thing—that is, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, in some places every day, in some places at certain intervals of days, is on the Lord's table prepared, and from the Lord's table is taken; by some, to life, by some, to destruction: but the reality of which it is the sacrament, is for every man to life, for none to destruction, whoever shall be partaker thereof.

"But lest they should think that in this meat and drink eternal life is in such sort promised, that whoso should take it should now no more die even in the body, this imagination He deigned to obviate. For when He had said, 'Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life,' straightway He subjoined, 'And I will raise Him up at the last day.' That he may have in the meanwhile, according to the spirit, eternal life in the rest which awaiteth the spirits of the saints: but, as regards the body, neither for it shall he be defrauded of eternal life, howbeit it shall be in the resurrection of the dead at the last day.

"'For my flesh,' saith He, 'is meat indeed, and my blood is drink

indeed.' Seeing that in meat and drink men aim at this, that they hunger not nor thirst, this thing verily and indeed doth nought afford, save only this meat and drink which maketh them by whom it is taken to be immortal and incorruptible: to wit, the very fellowship of saints, where shall be peace and unity, full and perfect. For to this end (as also men of God who were before us have understood this matter) did our Lord Jesus Christ betoken unto us His body and blood in things which are, out of many units, reduced to some one whole. For out of many grains is several made into one, and several doth out of many berries flow into one.

"In fine, He now expoundeth how that is effected which He saith, and what it is to eat His body and drink His blood. 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.' This, then, it is, to eat that meat and drink that drink: to dwell in Christ and to have Christ dwelling in him. And, therefore, who dwelleth not in Christ and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt doth neither [spiritually] eat His flesh nor drink His blood [albeit carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ]: but rather doth unto judgment to himself eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing [because, being unclean, he hath presumed to come unto Christ's sacraments, which no man taketh worthily save he that is clean; of whom it is said, 'Blessed are the clean in heart, for they shall see God.']

"What is it, then, that he goeth on to say, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing?' Let us say to Him (for He suffereth us, not gainsaying, but wishing to know): 'O Lord, good Master, how is it that the flesh profiteth nothing, when Thou hast said, Except a man shall eat my flesh and drink my blood, he shall not have life in him? Doth life profit nothing? And for what are we what we are, but that we may have life eternal, which Thou by Thy flesh dost promise? Then what is, The flesh profiteth nothing?' Profiteth nothing: yea, but as they understood it: for they understood the flesh, so as it is divided piecemeal in a dead body, or as sold in the shambles, not so as it is quickened by the spirit. Therefore, the flesh profiteth nothing, is said in like manner as it is said knowledge puffeth up. Ought we, then, straightway to hate knowledge? God forbid! And what is, Knowledge puffeth up? Of itself, without charity. Add, then, to knowledge charity, and knowledge shall be profitable, not through itself but through charity. So, likewise, now, 'The flesh profiteth nothing:' yea, but the flesh by itself: let the spirit be added to the flesh, as charity is added to knowledge, and it profiteth very much. For if the flesh profiteth nothing, the Word had not been made flesh,

that it might dwell in us. If, by means of the flesh, Christ hath much profited us, how profiteth the flesh nothing? But the flesh was the means whereby the spirit acted for our salvation. The flesh was a vessel: mark what it had, not what it was. The apostles were sent: did their flesh nothing profit us? If the flesh of the apostles profited us, can it be that the flesh of the Lord profited nothing? For whence came to us the sound of the Word, but by the voice of the flesh? Whence the pen of the writer, whence the writing? These all are works of the flesh, but by the spirit actuating, as one may say, His organ. 'It is the spirit,' then, 'that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing;' so as those Jews understood the flesh, not so give I my flesh to be eaten.

"Accordingly, 'The words,' saith He, 'which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.' For we have said, that what the Lord hath given us to understand in the eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood, is, that we should dwell in Him and He in us. Now, we dwell in Him when we are His members, and He dwelleth in us when we are his temple. But, that we should be His members, unity doth knit and compact us together. That unity may knit us in one, what save love effecteth? And the love of God, whence is it? Ask the apostle: 'The love of God,' saith he, 'is shed abroad in our hearts, by the holy spirit which is given us. Therefore it is the spirit that quickeneth:' for the spirit maketh living members. Nor doth the spirit make to be living members any save those which the spirit itself doth find in the body which it quickeneth. For the spirit which is in thee, O man, whereby it consisteth that thou art man, doth it make alive a member which it shall find separated from thy flesh? By thy spirit I mean thy soul; thy soul quickeneth not, save the members which are in thy flesh; if thou take away one, now is it no more quickened of thy soul, because it is not coupled to the unity of thy body. These things are said, that we may love unity, and fear separation. For there is nothing that a Christian ought so to dread as to be separated from the body of Christ. Since, if he be separated from the body of Christ, he is not a member of Him; if not a member of Him, he is not quickened by His spirit: for 'whoso,' saith the apostle, 'hath not the spirit of Christ, the same is none of His. The spirit,' then, 'it is that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I have spoken unto you, they are spirit and life.' What meaneth this, 'are spirit and life?' Are spiritually to be understood. Hast thou spiritually understood? 'They are spirit and life.' Hast thou carnally understood? Even so those 'are spirit and life,' but not to thee.

APPENDIX I.

DR. CLAGGETT'S PARAPHRASE ON ST. JOHN VI.

THE following paraphrase of the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, appears to me so important and valuable, that I have given it entire. It enters into the spirit of the conversation, seizes on the salient points, and, by uniting all the parts, throws a flood of light over the whole. But I will not detain the reader from the Paraphrase itself:

THE ARGUMENT.

This chapter begins with a narrative of the miraculous feeding of five thousand in the wilderness, and consisteth wholly of those passages that happened upon this occasion. The people were so overjoyed with the miracle, that they resolved to make Jesus a king; which he avoided, and secretly went to Capernaum. But they, not so satisfied, followed him thither the next day; when he took another course to prevent their design; and that by reproving their worldly-mindedness, and by calling them off from the cares and pleasures of this life, to mind heavenly things and everlasting life: which so turned their stomachs against him, that they fell to cavil at his sayings, and to disparage his miracles, by setting up the manna wherewith Moses had fed their fathers, against his feeding them the day before. Whereupon he inculcated two things upon them with great earnestness: the one was this, that they might gain eternal life by him and his doctrines; which he therefore called the "bread of life," and the "bread that came down from heaven;" and therefore that it was a vain thing in them to challenge him with Moses' giving their fathers that bread from heaven, which served only to sustain a mortal life. The other was this, that they had sufficient evidence of his coming from God; but that they believed not, because

of their worldly prejudices against him. Whereupon he tells them, that God had committed no other persons to his effectual care, to convince and save them, but such only who were disposed to receive the truth by an honest mind; and that himself was not bound to conquer the obstinacy of unteachable men. Notwithstanding all which, they proceeded to cavil at his sayings; and because, in allusion to the loaves he had multiplied, and to that manna which they boasted of, he had called himself the bread of life; and in pursuance of such figurative speeches, he did also express believing in him, and trusting in his death, &c., by eating his flesh and drinking his blood: they exclaimed against him, as if he had, in the literal sense, offered his flesh to be eaten; some of his own disciples also understanding him in that manner. To whom, indeed, he explained himself; but for all that, upon his free reproof of their insincerity, they left him. And then he proved the constancy of his twelve apostles, permitting them also to go, if they were not willing to stay; shewing withal, that he understood who were sincere, and who were not.

THE CHAPTER.	THE PARAPHRASE.
Ver. 1. After these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias.	1. I shall not mention those miracles which Jesus wrought between the passover last mentioned (c. v., ver. 1), and that which was now at hand (v. 4 of this ch.), saving that only of the loaves; which, though it be reported by all the other evangelists, yet they have omitted that discourse upon it which he had with the Jews. The occasion of it was this: he went in a boat with his disciples over that part of the lake of Genezareth in Galilee, which washeth the city Tiberias.
2. And a great multitude followed him, because they saw his miracles which he did on them that were diseased.	2. And a great multitude followed him on foot (*Matt.* xiv., 13) through Tiberias, some of them being diseased persons, whom he cured in the desert where they overtook him (*Luke* ix., 10).
3. And Jesus went up into a mountain, and there he sat with his disciples.	6. And he took his disciples with him to a mountain in that desert, to instruct them.

4. And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh.

4. But the people now hastening from all parts towards Jerusalem, because of the approaching passover.

5. When Jesus then lift up his eyes, and saw a great company come unto him, he saith unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?

5. The company that came to Jesus in this desert place, was greatly increased; which he observing, was desired by his apostles to speak to them to depart, and to provide for themselves: whereupon he said to Philip, Dost thou think it possible to procure meat for this multitude in the wilderness?

6. (And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do.)

6. (Which he said, not that he was at a loss what to do, but to prove the faith of the man, who was none of the forwardest to believe.) (c. xiv., ver. 9.)

7. Philip answered him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little.

7. Philip, not expecting a miracle, answered, All the stock we have will not buy bread enough for every one of these so much as to taste a little of.

8. One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him,

9. There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two small fishes; but what are they among so many?

8, 9. But Andrew presently interposed, saying, That they have five loaves and two small fishes; by which he seemed to expect that his Master would do some extraordinary thing, but what he knew not, the provision being so very little.

10. And Jesus said, Make the men sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down in number about five thousand.

10. Then Jesus commanded the twelve to dispose the men in order upon the grass, of which there was great plenty at that time of the year (see ver. 4), and so they did (not distrusting the event), and found the men to be about five thousand.

11. And Jesus took the loaves, and when

11. And when Jesus had blessed the little food that was there, by thanking the great

he had given thanks, he distributed to the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down; and likewise of the fishes as much as they would.

12. When they were filled, he said unto his disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.

13. Therefore they gathered them together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten.

14. Then those men, when they had seen the miracle which Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that Prophet which was to come into the world.

15. When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force to make him a king, he departed again into

Creator and Preserver of all things; he with his own hands delivered so many portions of it to the twelve, and commanded them to divide themselves to administer to the multitude: and the bread and the fish were so marvellously increased as it went through their hands, that every one of that great company had as much as he desired to eat.

12, 13. And when they acknowledged that they had eaten enough, he bade the twelve gather up the fragments, &c. And every one of them filled his basket with what was left; so that there were twelve baskets full of broken food, which was an evidence of the unquestionableness of the miracle, and that no juggle had been put upon the people's stomachs, since there remained so much to be seen after they had all eaten.

14. And this miracle was so plain, every one of them having his belly filled with it, that they called to mind (ver. 31), how Moses gave their fathers manna in the wilderness, and foretold that God would raise up a Prophet like unto him out of their brethren; and now they concluded that this was that Prophet, and the person that was to deliver them from the Romans, as Moses delivered their forefathers from the Egyptians, &c., since he, as well as Moses, could, in the greatest extremity, supply them with what provisions they should need.

15. And of this they talked so vehemently, that at last they resolved to make him their king, whether he would or not; which Jesus perceiving, he first sent away his own disciples, almost forcing them into the boat that brought them thither, and promised to be with

a mountain himself alone.

them before they came to the other side (ver. 17. Mark vi. Matt. xiv). And being thus rid of his disciples, who were pleased with the resolution of the people, and ready enough to join with them in it, he more easily satisfied and dispersed the multitude; and so without any followers he returned to the mountain to pray by himself.

16. And when even was now come, his disciples went down unto the sea,

16. Now it was just about the evening, when the disciples came down to the shore,

17. And entered into a ship, and went over the sea, towards Capernaum: and it was now dark, and Jesus was not come to them.

17. And entered into the boat to go over towards Capernaum; but it grew very dark before Jesus came to them.

18. And the sea arose, by reason of a great wind that blew.

18. And the sea also was tempestuous with a contrary wind (Mark vi., 48).

19. So when they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they see Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the ship; and they were afraid.

19. Insomuch that their sails being a hindrance to them, they laboured hard with their oars; and yet by the fourth watch of the night, they had not gained above twenty-five or thirty furlongs; when they saw Jesus walking upon the sea, as if he were passing by the ship; and not yet knowing him, they took him for an apparition, and were afraid (Matt. xiv., 26).

20. But he saith unto them, It is I; be not afraid.

21. Then they willingly received him into the ship; and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went.

20, 21. But when they knew him, they received him gladly, believing that all things would go well now he was with them, and so it proved: for though they had made so little progress before, yet now the ship came presently to the place whither it was bound.

22. The day fol-

22. Now, the people whom Jesus had fed in

lowing, when the people which stood on the other side of the sea, saw that there was no other boat there, save that one whereinto his disciples were entered, and that Jesus went not with his disciples into the boat, but that his disciples were gone away alone:

the desert, were not so perfectly dispersed, but that many of them kept together till the day following, and came to the shore where the disciples took ship the evening before; and although they knew there was no other boat there, when the disciples went to sea, but that into which they entered, and that Jesus did not go with them:

23. (Howbeit there came other boats from Tiberias, nigh unto the place where they did eat bread, after that the Lord had given thanks:)

23. (Though there came other boats from Tiberias afterwards, which these men found that morning, near the place where the miracle was wrought:)

24. When the people therefore saw that Jesus was not there, neither his disciples, they also took shipping, and came to Capernaum, seeking for Jesus.

24. Yet knowing that the disciples were gone, and not being able to find Jesus on that side, they believed he was gone after them, though they knew not how (ver. 25). And so they resolved to follow the disciples in those boats that were newly come from Tiberias, hoping to find Jesus himself with them at Capernaum or Bethsaida.

25. And when they had found him on the other side of the sea, they said unto him, Rabbi, when camest thou hither?

25. And when they found him, they desired to know by what miracle he got thither so soon, for they knew he went not over with his disciples, and no other boat was on the other side to transport him, but those in which they came; and the way by land, over the bridge of Tiberias, was too far about to get thither in so short a time.

26. Jesus answered them and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me not because ye saw the mi-

26. But Jesus, without satisfying their curiosity in this matter, turned the discourse to things of greater moment, and answered them in this manner: I certainly know that ye do not follow me for the true end of those miracles

racles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled.

27. Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth to everlasting life; which the Son of Man shall give unto you; for him hath God the Father sealed.

28. Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?

29. Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.

30. They said therefore unto him, What sign shewest thou, then, that we may see, and believe thee? what dost thou work?

which I work; that is, that ye might believe in me, and obtain everlasting life; but merely for that present benefit which you hope to receive by them, as you did yesterday, when you did eat, &c.

27. But I had a farther end in feeding your bodies, which now I require you to mind; and that is, to persuade you not to take so much pains for the prolonging of a life which will shortly end; as for that virtue and knowledge which are the food of souls, and the means of living happily for ever, when this life shall be no more. You should follow the Son of Man for such things as these, the Father having shewed him to be the person who should convey these blessings to the souls of men, and that by those wonderful works which He hath sent him to do for the relief of their bodies.

28. These men were so suddenly disgusted with this spiritual doctrine, that they replied in this manner: We who have the law of Moses, do already know what works God requires; and canst thou tell us what will be more pleasing to him than our keeping of the law?

29. Jesus answered, God hath sent his Son into the world to reveal a better doctrine, and to prescribe a better life, than Moses did; and that work pleasing to God, and necessary to your salvation, which you must do, is, in short, this: to believe in him whom God hath sent, and to take his word for your security, in doing all that he requires.

30. But they were so strangely prejudiced against Jesus, upon his calling them off from the cares of this world to a heavenly life and a better hope, that the late miracle for which they had so extolled him (ver. 14), was now in their opinion, nothing at all. And so they replied to him, as if they had said: If thou pretendest to a higher doctrine than Moses taught, why dost not thou show us equal, if not

greater signs and wonders than he wrought, that we may see them, and believe thee for their sake? What dost thou perform answerable to such a mighty faith as thou requirest of us?

NOTES.—*Ver.* 30. This sudden turn of theirs was so strange, that Grotius does not allow those that said this to be the same persons that were fed in the wilderness the day before. But I can see no reason for his opinion; for the evangelist plainly seems to continue the relation, as of the same persons; and it is no unusual thing for men either to keep or alter their persuasions, as they are led by their prejudices and interests. And our Saviour told those that had been fed in the wilderness, that they followed him for worldly advantages, and not for instruction in spiritual and heavenly matters (ver. 26). So that, finding themselves disappointed, it was not unlikely that they would fall in their opinion of him. To which we may add, that one main design of his following discourse was to shew that external evidence was not sufficient to create faith, without the inward preparation of a sincere and honest mind; which was very pertinent to the case of those men who were made confident that Jesus was that prophet, by the late miracle, till they found that his doctrine was contrary to their worldly affections. For which reasons, I have chosen to continue the discourse in the paraphrase as the text seems to direct; *i.e.*, between Jesus and the same persons that spake to him (ver. 25), rather than to substitute other speakers, for which there is neither authority of the text, nor any need upon the account of avoiding inconvenience.

31. Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat.

31. It is true, that in our need thou gavest us bread to eat, making five loaves to serve above five thousand of us. But what was this to Moses' feeding our fathers in the desert, who were vastly many more, and this for forty years, with manna also, which was not earthly food, such as we eat yesterday, but bread from heaven, as we are taught in *Psalm* lxxviii., 25.

32. Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.

32. Now, the reply that Jesus made to this, supposed that these men wanted not evidence of his coming from God; and that they ought not to compare the manna which their fathers eat with the bread that he had given them the day before, but rather with that inestimable blessing which God had now bestowed upon them, in giving his Son for the life of the world. And in this he pursued his constant design, of taking off their affections from worldly, and directing them to heavenly things. For he answered them to this effect: Whereas

you magnify Moses for giving your fathers bread from heaven, I tell you, it came not from that heaven which is the place of immortality, but only from that region of the air, which, though it be also called heaven, shall at last perish with the earth. But now God offereth unto you that which, in the most excellent sense, is heavenly bread, and which indeed comes from the place where his majesty dwelleth.

33. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

33. Whereas also you extol Moses for preserving the lives of your fathers in the wilderness so long as he did; you may consider it was but a short life at longest, which that bread served to sustain. But he whom God hath now sent from heaven, is indeed, and desires therefore to be called the true bread, because he can preserve you to eternal life. And lastly, the bread which Moses gave your fathers, did indeed serve a great many; yet they were but a very few in comparison; for that which I speak of, is sufficient to give eternal life to the whole world.

34. Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread

34. They replied hereupon: We desire no other bread than this which thou so highly magnifiest: give us but such bread always as this, and, without all question, we shall believe thee.

Ver. 34. They are still the same persons that speak, for there is yet no reason to suppose the contrary. And by this saying, it seems they understood Jesus as if he had spoken to them of bread from heaven, in the literal and gross sense, and by giving that to them, from day to day, had promised to make them live for ever; so that from his last words, they seemed to conceive some better hope of him again, and that he would go on to fill their bellies every day. Therefore they spake to him now with more respect. So hard it was even for Jesus to bring them to any understanding, or sense of things that concerned their minds, though he would lead them thereunto by allusion to things grateful to their senses. And this indeed was the general temper of the Jews in our Saviour's days, who were also in this respect rather worse than their forefathers. It was just such another answer that the Samaritan woman made to a like speech of our Lord, as you may see, ch. iv., 13, 14, 15.

35. And Jesus said

35. Jesus answered: If you understand me

unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me, shall never thirst.

aright, you have your wish. I do not now discourse of those signs which you desire to see before you believe (for you have already had signs in abundance), but of the far greater benefits which you will gain by believing in me, than your fathers had from Moses. I tell you, therefore, that I am the bread of everlasting life; and he that believeth in me, and submitteth to my doctrine, hath the bread and water of life, and shall hunger and thirst no more; for he shall need no other means of obtaining everlasting life, than to become my disciple.

36. But I said unto you, That ye also have seen me, and believe not.

36. Do not think that I take that for granted which I ought to prove; for you have already seen enough to convince you that I speak the truth. But as I told you before (ver. 26), signs and miracles will not work true faith in you so long as you follow me for temporal benefits, and have not learned to prefer spiritual good things, and everlasting life, above meat and drink, and all the enjoyments of this world whatsoever.

Ver. 36. These persons, of whom our Lord said that they believed not, were those very men, who, the day before, having seen the miracle which he did, said, "This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world." Whereby it should seem that then they believed, but that their minds were now changed, though upon no other reason than that they now perceived his great design was, to feed their minds with good doctrine, and not to pamper their bodies. Which is a plain instance how great a hindrance worldly-mindedness is to true faith, since, in this case, the same evidence which convinced these men, while they took our Saviour to be a benefactor to their bodies, had lost all its force with them when they once perceived that His great business was, to save their souls. Some also of our Lord's disciples were of this disposition; and it had the same effect upon them, as you may see, ver. 64.

37. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.

37. So that the reason why you believe me not, is because you are not prepared by a good and honest heart to receive the truth. And now I tell you, that the Father, who would have all to be saved, does not expect that I should give a good account of any other persons, but such as are of a towardly and teach-

able disposition. These he hath committed to my especial care; and they will learn of me, and not one of them shall want means requisite for his conviction and instruction. But though I came to save the world (ver. 51), I am not bound to bring those to faith and salvation, that obstinately set themselves against all that evidence which is sufficient for honest minds.

Ver. 37. It seems very reasonable to interpret these phrases of the Father's giving some to Christ, and drawing them, by what our Lord said (ver. 26), that these men followed him, because they did eat of the loaves; *i.e.*, not from a sincere desire of learning the truth, and attaining eternal life, but for worldly ends: for on the other side, the lusts of these men were the cause of their unbelief; on the other side, our Saviour says, that all who are given and drawn by the Father, would believe and become his disciples, and none else: therefore the Father gives those only to Christ who are prepared by an honest heart, and willingness to learn. The phrase is an allusion to what is often seen amongst us, *i.e.*, to a man's committing the care of educating a hopeful and promising child, to a wise and skilful master, with the expectation of having a good account of him at last. Not but that these expressions also imply the preparations of the heart to be from the Lord—neither does this hinder, but that our Lord must be understood to have done what was fit to prepare those whom he found so adverse as these men were. (See notes on ver. 45.) But the meaning is, that if men obstinately persisted in their sensual and worldly prejudices against the truth, God had provided no remedy for such men. And therefore, as St. Chrysostom shews, we must not argue in this manner,—viz., if "every one whom the Father draweth, or giveth, cometh to Christ, and none else; then those whom the Father giveth not, are discharged of all fault, and cannot justly be accused. For, says he, these are vain words and mere pretences; since the free choice of our own wills must go to the effecting of this matter: for to be taught, and to believe, depends much upon our own choosing."

38. For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

38. For in this matter, as well as in all others, I do what is as much the Father's will as my own. And I came from heaven to do it, and cannot depart from it. Observe, therefore, what I say.

39. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.

39. It was his pleasure to commit to my care all persons of honest and well-disposed minds, that not one of them should be lost, but that I should do all things which would bring them to faith and repentance, and should take care of their salvation from the first to the last, even till I shall raise them from the dead at the last day.

Ver. 39. Although the wicked shall be raised up at the last day, by the power of Jesus, as well as the just, yet when the resurrection is simply mentioned, it is commonly understood of the resurrection to eternal life, *i.e.*, the resurrection of the just. And by speaking of this resurrection at the last day, our Lord did now put them out of doubt, that he meant not to pamper their bodies, and to take care for their pleasures in this life; but that he spake to them of a better life after this, and the means of attaining it.

40. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

40. For it was his decree also, that every one who, seeing the works that I do (ver. 36), and attentively considering the evidence, whereby it appears that I came from God, does thereupon believe and follow my doctrine, that he, I say, should have everlasting life, and that I should for that end raise him up at the last day. Now, as my Father doth not expect that I should save any but those that believe and obey the Gospel, so neither doth he expect that I should bring any to faith, but those that are of teachable dispositions. But if men obstinately set themselves to oppose all means of conviction and reformation, it was no part of the trust committed to me by the Father, to reclaim them, notwithstanding their incorrigibleness.

Ver. 40. To see Jesus, signifies the same that it does ver. 36, *i.e.*, seeing his miracles and all other testimones of a divine authority that were discernible in him: only *θεωρῶν* seems to note an attentive consideration of them, which is proper to ingenuous and honest men, and will certainly produce faith. Whereas *ἑωράκατε* (ver. 36), may signify that careless and superficial sight of his works, proper to those men in whom prejudice so prevailed, that they saw, and yet believed not. Now that our Saviour does here, and elsewhere, repeat his doctrine concerning that inward work of God,—viz., an honest and godly disposition, is an argument that he laid great stress upon it; and that indeed this was the main thing they were to take pains with themselves about. For the outward evidence was given them whether they would or not; but the inward preparation, without which the outward evidence would do them no good at all, must in some part be their own work as well as God's: which was plain, from Christ's speaking to them so much about it as he did. For if it was not their own fault that they were not inwardly prepared; and if it was impossible for them to do anything considerable towards it, his reproof had seemed something unreasonable and unjust; and if they had so understood it, they had not been waiting to tell him so.

41. The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am

41. But the people were by no means pleased with what Jesus said; for they expected he would give them bread from heaven, as Moses

the bread which came down from heaven.

had done for their fathers (ver. 34); but now they plainly perceived, that by the bread of life coming down from heaven, which he spake of, he meant himself and his doctrine (ver. 25), and that, instead of feeding their bodies, he promised them everlasting life; which they were not greatly concerned about. And upon this disappointment, they again set themselves to disparage him all they could.

42. And they said, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it, then, that he saith, I came down from heaven?

42. And said one to another, Why does this man, whom we know to be the son of Joseph and Mary, pretend such high things of himself? How could he come from heaven, who was born into this world as other men are, and in as mean circumstances as the most?

43. Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves.

43. To these cavils Jesus answered, Do not lose time, by raising difficulties about my person and doctrine: there is another work that lies upon your hands, which is at present more seasonable and necessary for you, than to strain for objections against what I say; and that is, to mend your tempers; to shake off your worldly spirits; to make eternal life your end; and sincerely to desire the knowledge of that way which leads to it.

44. No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.

44. For if you are not thus qualified, all my sayings and works will never convince you of the truth: for the Father did not send me into the world with any other charge, than that I should do what is abundantly sufficient to save men of plain honesty and sincere intention; which dispositions, therefore, you should endeavour after; and if, by the grace of God, you obtain them, then you will readily understand and embrace the truth. But till then, you do but entangle yourselves to no purpose: and, therefore, I advise you to leave off objecting and disputing, till you have learnt plain duties, and to become honest men. And I tell you again, I will take care that no such persons

shall want abundant means of conviction and salvation, but they shall be my peculiar charge, from the time that they are so disposed, till I shall raise them up at the last day.

Ver. 44. St. Chrysostom observes, that upon this saying the Manichees confidently affirmed, that nothing was in our own power; for, said they, "If a man comes to him what needs he to be drawn? But, says he, this does not take away all power over our own actions, but rather shews that we stand in need of God's help, and that not every negligent person, but he that takes great pains with himself, will come to Christ." The true sense of this verse is more largely expressed in the paraphrase, and in notes upon ver. 37.

45. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.

45. And these admonitions I give you, are warranted by the prophets, who have foretold, that when the kingdom of Christ shall begin to be established upon the earth, men shall not want any reasonable means of conviction for the saving of their souls, because God will then vouchsafe to appear more remarkably to instruct men than ever he did since the world began: and therefore, if any man remains in unbelief, or refuses to obey, it cannot be for want of means to make him wise unto salvation, but for want of an humble and an honest mind, and a sincere intention; without which, God's speaking to men by his own Son, will have no success upon them, but leave them as bad as they were before. But because God is a Master, in whom nothing can be wanting to instruct, every one that desireth to know the truth, and to be saved, will submit to the doctrine of his Son, and become his disciple.

Ver. 45. The 54th chapter of Isaiah containeth a description of God's gracious care and providence over his Church; one instance whereof (ver. 13), is this—"And all thy children shall be taught of God." Which must needs imply these two things: 1. That God would reveal that truth which the Church should profess; and this was eminently done by the Son of God himself coming down from heaven to make it known, and by the Holy Ghost inspiring the apostles afterwards. 2. That God would abundantly satisfy men by divine testimonies, that he had sent his Son into the world for that purpose. For these reasons, all that believe in Christ are taught of God. Now, the force of our Saviour's argument, from this prediction, lies in this: if God hath promised to reveal to men the knowledge of saving truth, and to convince them that he doth reveal it; then no man to whom this revelation is made shall want sufficient means of instruction and conviction; and, consequently, every man that is not

under the power of worldly lusts and interests, will be effectually wrought upon by them. And this freedom from such prejudices, our Lord here calls hearing and learning of the Father, which is the same with being given or drawn to Christ (the phrase used before); and this intimates that it is something we do towards the preparing ourselves; and that we may also hinder it; for hearing and learning are voluntary actions. A man may stop his ears against instruction, and alienate his mind from what is suggested to him; therefore, something men may do to attain that honest heart which the divine inspiration worketh; they may also quench this work of the Holy Spirit. The meaning of the whole is, as if our Lord had said; You must have God for your Master, before you can be the disciples of the Son; you must be prepared by those qualities, which there is no need of a new revelation to teach you, before you are fit to receive that doctrine which the Son brings. And now it is plain, that these very speeches and reasonings of our Saviour, tended to prepare them for conviction and faith; for by shewing them the great need of a teachable spirit in hearing and learning of God; and what blessings the want of this disposition would bereave them of, and by repeating and inculcating upon them, that great concernment of the resurrection at the last day; he did what was most proper in itself to dispose them to a better mind, to weaken their prejudices, and to make them attend to those testimonies of his coming from God, which they had already seen, instead of desiring more signs, which in the temper they were in at present, would have done them no good if they had been granted.

46. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father.

46. The meaning of which Scripture is not, that any man shall be immediately taught by the Father: for the will of the Father is not thus to be manifested to any of you, it being the privilege of the only-begotten Son, intimately to know his mind, without the mediation of any other person (Matt. ii., 27).

47. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.

47. Take notice, therefore, of what I say, The will of my Father, which by me he makes known to you, is this, that he who receiveth my doctrine, firmly believing it, and submitting his heart and soul to it, shall as surely obtain everlasting life, as if he were possessed of it already.

Ver. 47. This saying of our Saviour explains all that he says about the necessity of eating, &c., shewing clearly, that he meant the believing of his doctrine, and being conformed to it in heart and life. For if he that believeth shall obtain everlasting life, then he eateth Christ, according to his meaning in this chapter, that believeth in him.

48. I am that bread of life.

48. And therefore, as I told you before, you are to look upon me as the true bread of life, whereof I have been speaking to you; for

I came down from heaven to guide you to everlasting life.

Ver. 48. Here our Lord calleth himself *bread* again, thereby implying what he afterwards expressed, that he is to be eaten. Now, most certainly we are in such a sense to eat Christ, as that is wherein he is bread. But no man will say, that Jesus was, or can be properly bread; therefore it is not eating him literally and properly that can be here meant, but only believing on him, which is by the same figure called eating, whereby he called himself bread.

49. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.

49. Which should make you concerned to attend my instructions, instead of desiring such bread as Moses gave your fathers in the wilderness, which served only to sustain a short life in this world, for they are long since dead that eat it.

50. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.

50. But I bring you food from heaven, which whosoever eateth, it shall preserve him to everlasting life: for I bring you a doctrine, the belief and obedience whereof will avail to your salvation; and I who bring it, am come with the highest authority to require your faith, and with divine testimonies of my authority to justify your faith; so that nothing is wanting to secure your salvation, but forwardness on your own parts to eat this heavenly food that I invite you to feast upon, now that it is brought down to you from heaven, and is as near you as that bread wherewith I fed you yesterday in the wilderness. Nothing is wanting, I say, but that you would think who it is that God hath sent to you, and of how great concern to your souls that message is which I bring you from heaven, and how abundantly God hath testified that I come from him to give you everlasting life; and that considering these things, you would act like reasonable men, believe what I say, and receive my doctrine into your very hearts and souls, and give thanks to God for his unspeakable gift.

Ver. 50. This is the first place where our Saviour, in pursuance of that figure of calling himself bread, expresseth believing in him (ver. 35, 47), by eating him. In the 35th verse, where he also calls himself the bread of life, he did not pursue the

figure throughout, by saying, he that eateth me, but he that cometh to me, *i.e.*, who is my disciple, shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me (not he that drinketh me), shall never thirst; which makes it very plain, that by eating here, we are to understand believing; not a corporeal, but a spiritual action. And because it does not yet appear that he limits the object of believing; we are, therefore, to understand him as speaking of the necessity of receiving his whole doctrine, and submitting to it in heart and life; which whosoever does shall not die, but live eternally.

51. I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

51. And when I tell you, that I am the living bread which came down from heaven, and which he that eateth of shall live for ever; as you are to understand this with respect to all that doctrine which I deliver, so especially with respect to that part of it, that I am come into the world to lay down my life for the salvation of mankind. And as I came for this end, so I will give my body to the death, for the life of the world; which is an infinitely greater benefit than either your fathers received from Moses, when he gave them manna to eat, or than you received from me yesterday, when you were filled with that provision which I made for your bodies.

Ver. 51. Without doing great violence to our Saviour's words in this place, they cannot be so understood, as if he promised to turn bread into his flesh, for the life of the world; as they must suppose, who would ground the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation upon this place. For if some such change were here to be understood, it must be quite contrary,—viz., a change of his flesh into bread; inasmuch as he calls himself the living bread, and says, that "the bread which he would give was his flesh, that he would give for the life of the world." If, therefore, it be insisted upon, that the words are to be properly understood, and that therefore a change must be supposed of one substance into another, it must not be of bread into the substance of Christ's flesh, but of Christ's flesh into the substance of bread; which interpretation, I think, nobody has ever yet been so unreasonable as to contend for. What account, therefore, is to be given of these words, but this—that our Saviour having hitherto pursued a figurative way of speaking, upon the occasion so often mentioned, went on in the same way of expression, to lay before them that principal doctrine of the gospel, that Christ was to die for the salvation of mankind; which is the plain sense of giving his flesh to be bread for us; for he gave his flesh for the life of the world, when he gave himself to the death for us all; and his flesh, so given, is bread to us, because his death is the means of our living for ever.

And whereas Christ mentioned the giving of his flesh for the life of the world as a future thing; and likewise the giving of his flesh to be bread; it does not follow that, because the former was to be performed upon the cross only, therefore the latter was to be performed only in the Eucharist. This, I say, does not follow, unless, it could

be proved that he promised, in those words, to give us his natural flesh to be eaten properly in the Eucharist; which I have shewn is impossible to be proved from hence. Still, therefore, we are to understand, not a corporeal, but a spiritual eating: and whereas our Saviour said, "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world;" the meaning is this—that his flesh shall be given for the life of the world once for all; but the spiritual food, or nourishment, which his flesh, so given, should afford, would be given evermore, not only in the Eucharist, but in the whole ministration of the Gospel; which holds forth the death of Christ to be believed, and offers the blessed fruits and advantages thereof to all that are disposed to partake of them.

It is also objected against this interpretation, that if the doctrine of our Lord's passion, and the believing of it, be here meant, no reason can be given why our Saviour should speak in the future tense—"The bread which I will give is my flesh;" since the spiritual food was no less given before the incarnation and passion of Christ, than afterward; for the patriarchs lived and were nourished by faith. And, therefore, if spiritual eating be only intended, Christ seemed to promise a new thing, which yet he had given of old: so that his promise is to be understood of giving his natural flesh to be eaten, which was never done before the Eucharist. This is the objection; and a very strange one it must needs be to him that shall consider, 1. That our Saviour speaketh in the future tense to the woman of Samaria, where yet the expression is acknowledged to be figurative, and the meaning of it to be believing: "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him (δώσω) shall be in him a well," &c. Now, would not this be rare arguing: Our Lord says, "I will give water;" therefore he promised something that he had never given before; therefore spiritual drinking, or believing, is not meant, because the patriarchs believed of old, therefore the promise is to be taken literally and properly? And yet this is that very argument to prove the literal sense in this verse. But then, 2. Our Lord speaks of the necessity of present eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, in the 53rd and 54th verses. And therefore the argument from the future tense, to prove that he spake properly of the Eucharist, is insufficient. 3. Supposing that all had been future, and that something was promised, more than had been formally given; yet it follows not that Christ spake properly of the Eucharist, much less of giving his flesh properly to be eaten there. For although the Fathers believed of old, yet the doctrine of the passion was never clearly understood by the faithful before our Saviour's time; no, nor as yet by his own disciples. Our Saviour did now and then mention it, and here he gave them some intimations of it, which they understood not then so well as they did afterwards. (See note on ver. 53). Himself said to them—"Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things that ye have seen, and have not seen them; and to hear those things that ye hear, and have not heard them" (Matt. xiii., 17). And yet his disciples hitherto had attained to a very imperfect knowledge of Christianity, to what they had afterwards. Although, therefore, the good men of old were justified by faith, and saw the promises afar off, and had some general intimations of the Gospel, yet whether the particular objects of our faith were not a new thing worthy of Christ's promise, I leave indifferent men to judge.

Lastly, it has been said, that the natural flesh of Christ was to be given or offered upon the cross substantially or properly for the life of the world, and therefore the same flesh was to be given with the same propriety, to be bread for us, and to be eaten by us—viz., in the Eucharist. To which I answer, 1. as

before, That this arguing will conclude more than they desire who urge it. For if the former clause is to be understood in the same strictness and propriety of words with the latter clause, then the flesh of Christ was to become bread properly. For he said, "The bread which I will give is my flesh." But, 2. It is much more reasonable to understand the giving of his flesh to be bread, according to the meaning of this kind of expressions throughout the whole discourse; and our adversaries do acknowledge that those passages, "I am the bread of life;" "He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever"—that is, all of this kind, from verse 32 to this very clause in verse 51, are to be understood of spiritual eating—*i.e.*, of believing. Since, therefore, our Saviour gave no manner of intimation that he changed his style, there is more reason to interpret those words, of giving his flesh to be bread, and of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, in a sense agreeable to that wherein eating him is to be understood all along before, than to understand them properly—that is to say, of bodily eating; although it is the flesh of Christ which is given to be eaten, that flesh which was substantially and properly given for the life of the world.

52. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

52. Upon this the Jews disputed against him afresh, the greater part of them taking his last words in a gross sense, as if he had promised to give them his flesh to eat with their teeth, and to swallow it down their throats, as their forefathers had eaten manna, and as they had eaten in the wilderness the day before. And upon this advantage which they thought they had against him, they exclaimed as if he had spoken absurdly and inhumanly, and taught his disciples to devour man's flesh.

53. Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

53. But notwithstanding this perverse construction of his words, Jesus did not think fit to deliver his meaning in such proper expressions as might avoid all the cavils of these unreasonable men; but, deferring for a while a further explication of himself, he vehemently repeated his doctrine, under such expressions and figurative speeches, as they had hitherto given him just occasion to use; only to signify that he was to die a violent and bloody death for the salvation of mankind: to that expression of eating his flesh, he added another, of drinking his blood; affirming, that except they did this, they must not expect eternal life. As if he had said, "Except ye believe the merit of that sacrifice which I shall offer for

the sins of the world, and own me for your Saviour in dying, a painful and ignominious death for your sakes, and learn charity, and patience, and humility, and resignation to the will of God, by my sufferings, ye have not spiritual, nor shall have eternal life."

Ver. 53. If it be asked, why our Saviour still persisted in a figurative and allusive way of expression, although he saw their gross, and perhaps wilful mistake of his former words (ver. 52.), it may be answered, That he knew good reason for it, though the reason be not left upon record. However, a probable conjecture ought to suffice in such a case as this, where the objection is, that no account can be given of it. I answer, therefore, that our Lord did not think fit to foretel the ignominious death he was to suffer upon the cross, so publicly as he foretold his resurrection. Sometimes he told his disciples that he was to suffer, and be killed (Matt. xvi., 21); but to others he intimated it obscurely, with intention that they might afterwards remember what he said, rather than that they should understand it presently. But neither to the multitude, nor to his disciples, did he clearly signify the reason and ends of his passion; this seeming to be one of those things that they could not bear now, but which the comforter should reveal to them afterward. It may therefore be said, that our Lord did not deliver the doctrine concerning the death he was to suffer, and the blessed fruits thereof to all believers, in such like plain words and expressions, as I have endeavoured to use in the paraphrase, because he used to conceal the former from the people, and reserve the clear manifestation of the latter, till after his resurrection and ascension, when these sayings would be brought to remembrance, and better understood than they were at first. But one may ask, why did he not at least tell these men, that these were still but expressions of spiritual things, by way of allusion to things sensible? To which I answer, that he did thus explain himself to his disciples presently after, and that upon occasion of this gross mistake (see ver. 62, 63), and nothing appears to the contrary, but that this explication was made in the synagogue, in the hearing of all. But whether it was so or not, it is sufficient for us that he explained himself as he did to the disciples.

In the mean time, Cardinal Cajetan's argument, that this place cannot be understood of the Eucharist, because then it would infer a necessity of the people's receiving the cup, is an argument *ad homines*, plain and strong. Neither is it to be avoided, by pretending that Christ does not speak of the species of either bread or wine, but of the things contained under them; and, therefore, that because whole Christ is contained under one kind, the condition of eternal life is fulfilled, by receiving him under either kind: for they that receive him under the species of a wafer, or a morsel of bread only, which is to be eaten, cannot with any modesty be said to drink his blood; which is yet made as necessary as eating his flesh. We grant, that eating and drinking being taken as figurative expressions, do signify the same thing,—viz., believing; and we say, that believing, when it is expressed by eating his flesh and drinking his blood, refers to that particular object of faith, the death of Christ, signified by the separate mention of his body and blood. But eating and drinking being taken properly, do not signify the same thing. If, therefore, our Saviour is to be understood properly, of receiving him in the Eucharist, by eating his flesh and drinking his blood: the words are plain, beyond all dispute, that he is to be received by drinking his blood there, as well as by eating his flesh; which, since the Church of Rome denies to the

laity, the Cardinal had good reason not to understand these words of the Eucharist, being concerned, as he was, to make the best of all those usages which he found in his Church. And yet I doubt this great man had not quite delivered that Church from all the reproof this very text has for their half-communion. For, although these words are not to be understood properly of the Eucharist; yet, I think, what Grotius says, cannot be reasonably denied,—viz., that here is a tacit allusion to the Eucharist. And if that be true, the text even thus taken, will condemn their withholding the cup from the laity. For the allusion must consist in this, that, as according to the institution of the Eucharist, the holy bread, and cup, were separately taken to shew forth the violent death of Christ; so in these words of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, the believing of his meritorious death, and following the example of his patience, &c., is expressed by the separate mention of his flesh and blood, and therefore of eating the one, and drinking the other. Which allusion is so apt, that I should not wonder if it inclines those that inquire no further, to believe that our Saviour here speaks of the Eucharist. But since the separate taking of the holy bread and the holy cup in the Eucharist on the one side, and the separate mention of his flesh and blood on the other, is that in which the allusion consists, it is utterly destroyed by the pretended concomitance,—*i.e.*, by giving the body and blood, not as separated, but as united; or by giving the body and blood to be eaten; not the flesh to be eaten, and the blood to be drunk. In short, as our Saviour did sacramentally represent his death, by taking the holy bread, and the holy cup separately, and giving them separately; so he did in words, alluding to that sacrament, represent the same death,—*i.e.*, by the distinct mention of his flesh and his blood; and he represented also the necessity of faith in his death, under the distinct expressions of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood. And therefore, they who in the Eucharist pretend to give both kinds in one, destroy the reason why these words allude to the Eucharist. But if they say, that our Saviour here speaks properly of the Eucharist, nothing can be more evident, than that they openly condemn themselves, in denying that to the people, which, as they say, he required in proper and express terms, and that is, the drinking of his blood.

And in truth, they destroy the significancy of the sacrament, which is no otherwise a representation of our Lord's death, than as it represents the separation of his flesh and blood. And then I desire them to tell me, how they can be said to commemorate the death of Christ, by receiving a sacrament that shews forth the separation of his body and blood, who do not receive them separated, but united? St. Paul, concluding the end of the sacrament, from the institution of it, said, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." The reason whereof is exceeding plain,—viz., because the separation of the blood from the body, is shewn by the distinct taking of the bread and the cup, to eat the one and drink the other. But this reason is so confounded by the half-communion, and the doctrine of concomitance, that the institution is not only contradicted, but, I fear, the sacrament is denied to them that receive one kind only; and that they have not so much as a half-communion, inasmuch as they do not receive a sacrament that shews the death of Christ.

54. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

54. "But he that is so far from rejecting me, and being offended at me, because of that painful death which I am to suffer, that he doth, on the other hand, receive all that divine instruction which it does afford, and turns it into spiritual nourishment, by learning the high

displeasure of God against sin; and his infinite love to mankind; and the vanity of this world, and the worth of his own soul, and the necessity of repentance, and of a godly life; my death shall be to him a means of that eternal life, to which I shall raise him at the last day; and this as certainly as if he were now in actual possession of it."

Ver. 54. Because our Lord continues in his speech to make a separate mention of his flesh and blood, it follows that he still speaks of his death, and the particular doctrine concerning his death, which would be entertained with the greatest difficulty—viz., that he was a sacrifice for the sins of the world; and therefore a Saviour, because crucified, &c. The lively belief whereof is that which our Lord means by eating his flesh, and drinking his blood; and not eating and drinking the sacrament of his body and blood; which a man may do to his condemnation. And, therefore, although St. Austin sometimes understood these words of the Eucharist, yet he did not so understand them, as if every one who partakes of the Eucharist does also eat the flesh, and drink the blood of Christ; for he manifestly denied that the wicked were partakers of the very body of Christ, though they partook of the sacrament of his body: and yet it is impossible but they must do the one as well as the other, if it be true that the proper substance of the body of Christ is in the sacrament, as the Church of Rome pretends. And by consequence, if this corporeal eating be intended, it seems clearly to follow, that no man who partakes of the Eucharist can be damned; which is certainly very false; and therefore corporeal eating cannot be meant here, but only spiritual eating. And so St. Austin understood it, although he applied these words sometimes to the Eucharist, inasmuch as he denied that the wicked do eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, although with their mouths they take the sacrament of his body and blood. But because this spiritual eating, which is necessary to salvation, is by no means confined to the participation of the Eucharist; and because many do not partake spiritually in the body and blood of Christ, that yet do partake of the sacrament, I cannot understand why our Saviour should speak here directly and properly of the Eucharist; and therefore I adhere to the sense of those Fathers who interpret this place, and those that follow, of spiritual actions only.

55. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

55. "So that the doctrine concerning my sufferings and death, which will give the greatest offence to unbelievers, is the most excellent meat and drink, because it is the food of souls, when it is received with a firm and efficacious faith; and will secure also the resurrection of the body to everlasting life."

Ver. 55. He continues to distinguish the flesh from the blood, and therefore still speaks of his passion, giving some kind of pre-eminence to faith in his death, above the belief of other particular doctrines, though that would be admitted with greatest difficulty.

56. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

56. "And therefore he that believeth my death to be a sacrifice for the sins of the world, and does thereby learn that duty which it teacheth, and receive that comfort which it affordeth, he will love me, and devote himself entirely to my service, because I have thus humbled myself; though that be the reason for which such as you will be violently prejudiced against me. And on the other side, he shall be peculiarly beloved and cared for by me: for though, in love to mankind, I am to be made an offering for sin, yet it is a particular care I shall express towards those who have a true sense of my sufferings in their behalf, who make a right use of them, and return that thankfulness and obedience which their faith requires." (1 Tim. iv., 10).

Ver. 56. His pursuance of the same expression still shews that he speaks of the same thing—viz., believing his death to be a sacrifice, &c. And here he intimates that his sufferings, which would be a stumbling-block to unbelievers, would be an effectual engagement to all good men to love him; and that their fervent love, and humble gratitude, would be rewarded with his especial love. For as God's dwelling in men signifies his gracious presence amongst them, and his delight in doing them good, so their dwelling in him signifies their love to him, and constant attendance upon the doing of his will, and the delight they have in knowing themselves to be always in his presence.

57. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.

57. "And one remarkable expression (and that of weight enough to make you consider what I say) of my peculiar love to every such believer, is what I have told you already, and I do earnestly repeat it again: as sure as the Father who sent me will raise me from the dead, so surely will I raise up every one to everlasting life that believeth my doctrine, and liveth by his faith."

Ver. 57. Here our Lord seems to leave the special consideration of his sufferings and death, and to speak now of his whole doctrine, as he had done before; for as by eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, we are to understand believing the merit and instruction of his death, &c., so, by eating him, we are taught before (ver. 35, 47, 50) to understand believing him in general—that is, believing all his doctrine.

58. This is that bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.

58. "Mark, therefore, what I said to you (ver. 33, 35) at first, that I am that true bread from heaven, wherewith the manna that your fathers eat, and the bread which you eat yesterday, are not to be compared; for they were good for nothing but to preserve a mortal life for a short time; whereas he that feedeth upon the word and doctrine which God hath sent you from heaven, shall be raised from the dead, to ascend thither, and to live there for ever."

Ver. 58. Here he concludes all, with returning to the same thing, and using the very expressions that he began withal (ver. 32, 35, 50), than which we need not a clearer proof that he all along spake in the same style, and in those expressions of eating and drinking, perpetually alluded to the manna and the loaves in the wilderness; which gave occasion to all this discourse.

59. These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.

59. These things he said publicly in the synagogue at Capernaum, where the people, whom he had fed in the wilderness, found him (ver. 24, 25), and gave him the occasion of discoursing in this manner, by following him for the loaves (ver. 26), and (when they found themselves disappointed) by setting the manna which Moses gave their fathers against the feeding so many thousands the day before (ver. 31). And the great end of his discourse upon this occasion, was, to draw their minds from worldly to heavenly things, and to make them more desirous of the spiritual and heavenly benefits of his miracles, than of the bodily relief which they had found by them.

60. Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this, said, This is an hard saying; who can hear it?

60. But because he expressed his mind in this figurative way, and was by many understood, as if he had commended to them the eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood, in the literal sense; therefore many, even of those that had for some time followed him, talked amongst themselves, as if these sayings of their Master must needs be offensive to the ears of all persons that had a sense of humanity; and as for themselves, that they knew not what to make of them.

61. When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you?

61. Neither did they desire him to explain himself further; but he, by his divine spirit, knowing what they muttered amongst themselves, applied himself to them in particular, and upbraided them in this manner for taking so unreasonable an offence against him.

62. What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?

62. "When you shall see me ascend up to heaven, it will not seem strange that I came down from thence; and because even then it will remain necessary that you should eat my flesh and drink my blood, you may be sure I do not mean that gross feeding upon my flesh, and drinking my blood, in which you understand what I have said; for my body will then be too far removed from the conversation of mortal men, to be capable of being so used.

63. It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.

63. "No; when I speak to you of the conditions of obtaining everlasting life, though I have now expressed them by eating my flesh and drinking my blood; yet you had reason to understand me of spiritual actions, which do indeed tend to the bettering of the inward man. For they are such things only that feed the soul, and can preserve it to eternal life: but to this purpose the flesh profiteth nothing; no, not my own flesh, if you should eat it as grossly as you understand my sayings: for even this would be but bodily nourishment, but would have no influence upon the mind. But if you would know what those things are that better the soul (and it is my business to call you off from that solicitous care you take of your mortal bodies, to mind your souls, and to provide for a blessed resurrection): if, I say, you would know what things are proper for the improvement of the mind, they are the words that I speak unto you, they are those precepts of a heavenly life, and those promises of eternal life which I have laid before you; that faith which I require you to have in my death, and that example of doctrine, charity, and humility,

which I require you to follow. These are the spiritual means of renewing your minds, and therefore means also of fitting you for eternal life."

Ver. 61, 62, 63. Our Lord perceiving how grossly the Jews and some of his own disciples understood those expressions, of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, did, upon this occasion, explain his own meaning as fully as he did to Nicodemus in the point of regeneration. For Nicodemus having said, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Which was as much as to say, "The flesh profiteth nothing (as here, ver. 63). And if you were, by a strange miracle, to be born again the natural way, by this fleshly birth you would come again but into a mortal life; but that fleshly birth would not avail you for everlasting life." In the very same manner our Saviour repeated, in this chapter, those sayings which the Jews, and some of his own disciples, were offended at; and in the same manner he explained them afterwards, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Which, being compared with the answer to Nicodemus, now mentioned and explained; by the light that answer affords, can yield no other meaning, than that which I have expressed in the paraphrase.

As for the 62nd verse, it might be intended as an answer to that particular exception against him, mentioned verse 42, that he was the son of Joseph, and could not therefore reasonably pretend to come down from heaven: to which, if our Lord referred, his words are a proper answer,—viz., that when they should see him ascend into heaven, they would no longer doubt of the truth of his coming from thence. But I rather think those words refer to that great offence which some of his own disciples took against him, that he should speak of their eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood; for they were his disciples only that saw him ascend. And when they should know that he was in heaven, they could not, without great stupidity, think that he would give them his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink, in that gross sense wherein they understood him. However, I have put both these interpretations into the paraphrase.

64. But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.

64. "But no wonder that you wrest my sayings to so absurd a sense as you do; for there are some amongst you that dislike my doctrine, and are grown weary of following me, and wait for an opportunity to leave me." For as soon as any man professed himself his disciple, Jesus knew how he stood affected towards him. And he did not only know who of the multitude that followed him would revolt, but likewise which of his apostles would betray him. (See ver. 36.)

65. And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.

65. And Jesus added, "Because I knew that there were some such amongst you, therefore I thought fit to tell you before (ver. 37, 39, 44), that my doctrine would never be heartily entertained by any but those whom God had prepared for it, by enduing them with a mind willing to learn, and with a prevailing desire of obtaining God's favour, and eternal life."

66. From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.

66. Upon this close application of his doctrine to the consciences of those insincere disciples of his; they finding themselves discovered, and that it was to no purpose to dissemble, resolved to pretend themselves his disciples no longer, and went off from him without more ado.

67. Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?

67. Jesus seeing them turn their backs upon him, took this occasion, both to shew that some of his disciples were sincere, and that he cared not to be followed by any but those that were willing; and therefore he said to the twelve, You see I do not compel men to follow me, but that I let them depart if they will go. Now, what say you? Will ye still continue my disciples, or follow the example of these men, and go away?

68. Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

68. Whereupon Peter (who was still the most forward speaker in his Master's cause), answered for himself and the rest: Lord, our greatest concern is to attain eternal life; and there is none other but thyself who can guide us to it. And we understand, that those very sayings of thine, with which these men were so unreasonably offended, do shew us the necessity of believing thy words and doctrine (as thou didst now tell them) (ver. 63), that we may live for ever.

Ver. 68. "Thou hast the words of eternal life." This saying of St. Peter confirms the interpretation I have given of verse 63. For here he seems plainly to repeat our Lord's sense almost in the same words; "the words that I speak unto you, they are life;" or, the words of eternal life; as if St. Peter had said, We do not understand thee in that gross and absurd sense to which these men have perverted thy sayings;

for we perceive that thou speakest of those doctrines and revelations by which we are to be guided to eternal life. But if St. Peter had understood our Saviour in that sense wherein the unbelieving Jews and his revolted disciples understood him, St. Peter's answer would surely have been to this purpose. Whatever appearance there is of inhumanity and contradiction, in giving thy flesh to be eaten, and thy blood to be drunk, for the life of the world; yet we believe that we shall eat thy natural flesh, and drink, &c., because thou hast said it; for though this hard saying staggered those men that are gone off, yet it does not stagger us at all. This had been a confession of faith suitable to the occasion, and to the spirit of St. Peter, if he had understood our Saviour as the Jews did. At least he would have used those very expressions which our Saviour used when the Jews took offence,—*i.e.* he would have said, To whom should we go but to thee, who wilt give us thy flesh to eat, and thy blood to drink, that we may have eternal life? But when he rather chose to confess his faith in the explanatory words (ver. 63), "Thou hast the words of eternal life," I think a reasonable man must acknowledge, that St. Peter did not understand our Saviour's expressions as the perverse Jews understood them.

69. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.

69. And we have already arrived to this faith, by seeing thy mighty works, and hearing thy divine doctrines; for by these testimonies we are convinced, beyond all doubt, that thou art the promised Messias; and whereas these men called thee the Son of Joseph, we assuredly believe that thou art the Son of that God who giveth life to all, and wilt give eternal life to all that believe in thee. And to this answer of Peter's all the rest assented.

Ver. 69. And St. Peter having thus shewed plainly enough what he understood by the flesh and blood of Jesus,—viz., his doctrine, or words of eternal life; he shews as plainly in this verse what he and the rest understand by eating,—viz., believing, as Jesus himself had explained it before (ver. 47). Therefore, says he, "And we believe and are sure," &c. So that by what St. Peter said upon this occasion, it appears sufficiently, that if Jesus had meant the literal and gross sense, the Jews and the disciples that forsook him understood him aright; but Peter, and the rest of the apostles and disciples that staid, mistook him; which is certain they did not, because our Saviour approved what St. Peter said in the name of all the rest. And in the interpretation of our Saviour's words, it is, I believe, more safe to follow St. Peter, with the approbation of our Saviour, than to follow any of his successors without it.

70. Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?

70. But this being spoken in the name of all, Jesus, to shew that he as well understood the hearts of his twelve apostles, as he did of the multitude of his disciples (ver. 64), answered them to this purpose: What one of you hath said in behalf of all, is true of all but one. I have indeed chosen you twelve before all my

other disciples, to be my chief companions and ministers; but there is one of you who already hates me, and is treacherously bent to do me mischief.

71. He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

71. Though he did not mention Judas the traitor, yet he meant him, and not any other of the apostles.

THE CONCLUSION.

And now I heartily beseech all into whose hands these papers may chance to come, not to think that this chapter is to be done withal, when they are once satisfied what our Lord's meaning was in those expressions of "eating him," and the like; but that they would please to attend to the reason and end of these and such kind of sayings; which will convince them, I doubt not, that this excellent chapter is fit to be thought of, and laid to heart every day they live.

Great pity it is, that this portion of God's word also should come to be a bone of contention; which was designed to beget and improve, in the disciples of Jesus, a spirit of true wisdom and piety, and to establish them in a holy life.

That which our Lord principally aimed at, in all this discourse, was to make his hearers concerned in good earnest for their eternal state, which will at first sight appear to any man that mindeth how often those sayings return, of "everlasting life," and "living for ever," and being "raised up at the last day." Now this, indeed, seemed to be his great design in almost all his sermons and applications to the people; from whence we may gather this profitable instruction, that men were more or less prepared to receive the truth as it is in Jesus, according as they were more or less affected with the end of his coming into the world, which was to bring them to everlasting life.

But in this chapter, and in some others, there is a peculiar instruction tending to this purpose, which we ought all of us very frequently to consider, not slighting it, because it is very plain, but making much of it, both because it is very useful, and strongly suggested by our Lord himself. And it is, in short, this: that the care we are at, and the pains we take for the welfare of this short life, should awaken in us a greater care and concern for our everlasting welfare: and that we, who are so thoughtful and diligent in pursuing our temporal interests,

should be ashamed, and count ourselves reproved by our worldly cares, if we are not much more careful to work out our salvation. This was the method our Lord took to bring those people to wisdom; and, therefore, he represented to them the means and conditions of everlasting life, under the names of those things which their hearts had hitherto been most set upon,—*i.e.*, bread, and eating, and drinking. For these were the men that had been fed by him the day before; and now they followed him for the loaves, that is, in hope to reap such bodily advantages as these from him every day. But to bring them to some sense of better things, and to lead them towards a due esteem of that end for which he came into the world, he proceeds in his admonitions, by calling the spiritual benefits which he had in store for them—bread and food; and their receiving those benefits, eating and drinking; ever and anon letting them know, that if they eat and drank of that food which he came to give them, they should live for ever. And what was the instruction of this way of discoursing to them, but that, if the bodily food, for which they were so solicitous, were a valuable enjoyment, which yet would serve but for the prolonging of a mortal life, how ought they to hunger and thirst for the meat which would preserve them for ever? And, therefore, when he came, in the same way of speaking, to intimate to them those benefits of his passion, which they would better understand afterwards than they could at present, he told them, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;" as if he had told them, in plainer words than he thought fit to use at that time: "It is infinitely more profitable to enjoy the fruits of my sufferings and death, by being reconciled to God, by forbearing to provoke his justice, and by following my example, than if I should take the same care of you as long as I live, which I did yesterday, when I fed your bodies by a miracle."

And this, indeed, seemed to be our Saviour's great design in preaching the necessity of faith and repentance, and a godly life to the people, under so many figurative expressions as we find he used,—viz, to lead them by temporal things to the care of things eternal, and to raise their minds from earth to heaven by a most familiar and convincing way of arguing with them, from earthly things themselves. Therefore, if he found them valuing themselves upon their liberty, or careful for life, or labouring for wealth, or solicitous for food: he called himself sometimes, and sometimes his doctrine, and their receiving of it, liberty, life, and treasure, and meat, and drink, as occasion required; and this to let them understand, that there was a more real good to be found in faith and piety, than in these or any other kind of worldly advantages; and that, whatever reason they had to be concerned for these

transitory enjoyments, they had much more to be careful in receiving as they ought those spiritual good things which he came to confer upon them.

If, therefore, we will suffer ourselves to be instructed by such passages as these are, most of us, I fear, may learn, from our concern about the things of this world, to be ashamed of our remissness in providing for a better: and all of us should learn to reflect very often upon matters of greater concernment, when we are engaged even in the honest designs of this life, and pursuing the lawful business thereof; and so we should in some measure preach to ourselves, as Christ once did to his hearers when he was upon earth.

And we should not think that the Jews only had need of this kind of instruction, who, I confess, had been educated under a law, that promised little else besides temporal advantages to those that observed it; but that we ourselves, who know the great blessings promised in the Gospel to be spiritual and eternal, stand in need also of such admonitions as these are: for the cares of this world, and the love of its riches, and pleasures, and honours, are as apt to take hold of us as they were of the Jews, if we do not take pains to affect ourselves deeply with that truth concerning another life, which our Lord Jesus hath revealed, and to the belief of which we have been educated in his Church. And if we have less prejudice against these doctrines than the Jews had, and yet are swallowed up with this world as much as they were, we are but the more inexcusable. So that, undoubtedly, the advantage we have over them should make us the more concerned to lay those things to heart; because we are so much the more to blame, if, knowing these things almost from our infancy, we do not practice accordingly.

Nay, when the profession of the true faith does bring in worldly advantages, there seems to be as much (if not more) reason to reflect in this manner upon ourselves, as when nothing was to be gotten by it in this world but the loss of all things. We are, then, doubtless, to remember, that the "kingdom of Christ is not of this world," and that the good things of this life are not the rewards which he hath promised; but that, by setting our hearts inordinately upon that worldly ease and profit which we enjoy by the profession of true Christianity, we are in the way of losing that fruit thereof which will last for ever, and the hope of which was all that our Lord used to invite men to become his disciples.

If we follow Christ for the loaves, we shall forsake him when we find ourselves disappointed, as the Jews at Capernaum did, and take occasions and pretences so to do as easily as they and some of his own disciples found them. For we are not to think that that saying, "Except ye eat the flesh," &c., was the true cause of their going off

from him, but only such a plausible occasion as they had a good while waited for. The reason of their offence, at the bottom, was, that they had long since perceived our Saviour was not likely to satisfy their worldly expectations, and they did not believe it worth their while to follow him for a reward in another life; which prejudice against him had destroyed all their faith, as he told them himself, "There are some among you that believe not" (ver. 64). They were those that said (ver. 60), "This is an hard saying, who can hear it?" For it is not said that *all*, but only, "*Many* of his disciples, when they had heard this, said, This is an hard," &c.,—viz., those very men of whom he said, "But there are some among you that believe not" (ver. 64), *i.e.*, who had followed him for worldly advantages, as the Jews did from the wilderness to Capernaum: of whom our Lord said the same thing,—viz., that "they believed not" (ver. 36). For though, but the day before, they had acknowledged him to be the prophet that was to come into the world; yet, finding that he was likely to disappoint their worldly hopes, they presently changed their opinion of him. So that a sincere aim at everlasting life is very necessary, even towards a constant belief and profession of the faith.

And much more to a practice answerable to it; which will, as I said before, be advanced not a little, if we will use ourselves to consider what care we are at for these mortal bodies and this worldly life; and what reason there is to be incomparably more concerned for a blessed resurrection to eternal life, which, I make not the least doubt, is the great instruction we are to learn from these figurative discources of our blessed Saviour. And if we constantly have it in our eye, it will not only render the *meaning* of this chapter very plain, but the *reading* of it, if we should read it every day we live, very useful to us.

And, indeed, those parts of God's word, which are purposely designed to work in us a deep concern for everlasting life, ought to be very present to our minds, and to dwell richly in us, that we may be always well provided to resist the temptations of the world. For which reason we should often think of those lessons of our Saviour: "Lay not up for yourselves treasure upon earth, where moth and rust do corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasure in heaven, where neither moth," &c. And, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell: yea, I say unto you, fear him." And that in this chapter, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you."

Which rules seeming at first sight to discharge us of all care for our life and welfare in this world, St. Chrysostom thought it needful to observe upon the last of them, that our Lord did not intend to countenance laziness, who himself said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive:" and that St. Paul admonishes a man to "work with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." But since these exhortations run, as if we were to be absolutely unconcerned about this life, no question but that care of eternal life is prescribed, in comparison to which our cares for this world should seem nothing at all. Therefore, when we desire our appointed food, we should think how much more it is our interest to "hunger and thirst after righteousness," and that "meat which endureth to everlasting life." And when we most of all feel the hopes and fears of things that go on farther than this world, we cannot entertain a better thought than this, that if we are so much concerned for this life, how careful ought we to be not to miss of eternal salvation?

Which kind of reflections are the more necessary for us, the more deeply we are engaged in this world. For we do not only "labour for the meat that perisheth," that is, for just enough to serve the necessities of life; but we would be at ease beside, and live in reasonable plenty, and enjoy what is convenient for the pleasure, as well as the sustenance of life; and they are very few that know when to make an end of multiplying riches, when once they are got into the way of increase. But we are thus concerned for an end of infinitely greater moment? Or rather, do not these very worldly cares reprove our negligence about better and greater things, while perhaps we do no more towards our salvation than to avoid the grossest sins of all, but take little thought how to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ?"

The whole strain of our Saviour's discourse in this chapter naturally leads to such considerations as these; and if we mind them in good earnest, they will, by the grace of God, moderate our affections and cares about this world in the first place, and then leave all that concern for the present and transitory good things, which we cannot be without, as a perpetual admonition, to be much more thoughtful for our everlasting salvation, and to make it the greatest business of our lives, by prayers and good works, to lay up for ourselves treasure in heaven, and to lay the stress of our comfort whilst we are here, in the joyful hope of being raised up at the last day to live for ever Amen.

APPENDIX K.

Birkbeck, in his "Protestant Evidence," gives, at the end of his authorities of the fifth century, an answer to the six points of Bellarmine's "*Synopsis Patrum*," for the real presence, in the Popish sense. I think it will be valuable to the reader, as a general reply to the authorities alleged from the early writers of those ages, and therefore I print it here entire:

§ 5.—*Bellarmine's Synopsis Patrum for the Real Presence discussed and answered.*

1. Bellarmine, having made a long and tedious dispute *de Eucharistia*,* producing divers testimonies of Fathers successively from age to age, for proof of the real presence, at length reduceth them all into one full body, consisting of six classes or ranks. And here he makes his *sedem belli*, resolving to fight it out upon these grounds, with his troops of ancient Fathers, and old-trained soldiers, some whereof served under the Church in the first six centuries. Now, if he be not able to charge us through in these prime ages, wherein his life-guard, and, indeed, the main battle consists, the rest of his train-band cannot hurt us; yea, we hope to make wash-work of that other shattered company he leads on in the succeeding ages.

2. It is true, indeed, he makes a great show of Fathers and schoolmen, and other new-raised men; but they are but borrowed soldiers, with Romish colours put upon them, such as do but serve to fill up his muster-book.

3. He voucheth some vehemently suspected, even by their own Rabbis, not to be the men whose names they bear, and therefore

* Lib. ii. de Euchar., c. 39.

incompetent. Such are Ignatius, Cyril of Jerusalem's Catechisms, Ambrose *de Sacramentis, et de Mysteriis initiandis,* Eusebius Emissenus, Cyprian *de Cœna Domini,* the Nicene Canon, with others.

4. Again, some he allegeth, who by reason of their non-age, deserve not to be reckoned in the number of the Fathers, and so are too young to bear witness herein. Such are Damascen, Theophylact, Euthymius, Nicephorus, and Rupertus, who, besides his minority, was also in this point erroneous. And now to the survey.

§ 1.—*The first Objection,* ab Appellationibus Eucharistiæ, *answered.*

Objection.

Bellarmine's first proof is taken, *à modo loquendi,* from the manner of the Fathers' language: they call the Eucharist not a symbol of Christ's body, but *corpus Domini,* the body of the Lord.

Solution.

1. They call it so, and so it is; and yet there be of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, that style it as we do. Tertullian saith, "He distributed His body, *id est, figura corporis mei,*—that is, a figure of His body."* Saint Augustine saith, "Christ doubted not to say, 'This is my body,' when He gave a sign of His body."† Theodoret calls it a symbol;‡ and Origen, "a symbolical body."§ Theodoret, in the place alleged, calls it "*σύμβολον καὶ τυπὸν σώματος, καὶ ἅματος,* a symbol and type." And Gregory Nazianzen, speaking of his sister, saith: "If she had laid up any part of the antitypes (or symbols) of the precious blood of Christ."‖

2. Some of them, as, namely, Theophylact and Euthymius, say: "It is not only a figuration of Christ's body."¶ We grant it; but they say not, that whatsoever is sanctified, and more than figureth, is therefore transubstantiated.

3. In a word, they affirm that Christ's true body is in the sacrament, and we affirm the same also; for with them, *secundum veritatem,* or *in veritate,* is as much as to say, *in virtute;* not properly and essentially, but virtually, effectually, and sacramentally. And this is that which Remigius and Alcuinus say, "*Est in veritate corpus Christi*: it is in

* Advers. Marcion, lib. iv., c. 40. † Contra Adimant., cap. 12.
‡ Dialog. 1. c. 8. *τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ, τὸ τοῦ σώματος ὄνομα τεθεκεν.*
§ Origen in Matt., cap. 15.
‖ *Εἰ ποῦ τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων.* in fun. Gorgon. ¶ Cent. 11.

truth Christ's body;"* and Hesychius and others, "*Est corpus Christi secundum veritatem:* it is Christ's body according to truth and verity." A truth, not of propriety—to wit, not in propriety of speech, and according to the letter, but a truth of efficacy and operation, as is shewn already in the first century, and the fifth article of this Evidence.

4. The Fathers, as they say it is *verum corpus*, so likewise they term it *idem corpus*, the self same body. Primasius saith, "It is the same body which he took of the Virgin's womb, the same that was crucified."† "*Idem substantialiter*," saith Anselm. Truly so, say we: it is *idem objective*, not *idem subjective*.

5. In a word, they say, *corpus Domini*, that Christ's true body is in the sacrament; and so say we. But they speak not of any such real presence, as the Romanists imagine, who hold a corporal manner of presence (excepting only relation to place).

§ 2.—*The second Objection drawn,* à comparatione, *answered.*

Objection.

The Fathers compare the sacraments of the old law with ours, calling them the type and shadow, ours the truth and the body.‡

Solution.

They do so, not as if theirs had been naked signs without the truth; theirs *significantia* only, and ours the *res significata* (for both theirs and ours relate to the same Christ); but because theirs were more types obscurely shadowed forth, and ours antitypes,‖ corresponding thereunto, and set forth to the life.

Objection.

Either you must grant a real presence, or it would follow that the sacraments of the old law equalize or exceed yours; for their passover, their shew-bread, and manna, excelled your sacramental elements of bread and wine in the Supper. Now, it is absurd to say the figure is better than the thing prefigured.

Solution.

1. There be other ways wherein ours excel theirs, and yet no such real presence; verily, not in the worth or value of the outward elements

* Remig. Cent. 6. Hesych. 7. Cent. Alcuin. 8. Cent.
† Primas. Cent. 6. Anselm. 11. ‡ Hierom. in cap. 1. ad Titum.
‖ 1 Pet. iii, 20, 21.

(for their manna might be better than our communion bread), nor yet in the thing signified, for that is one and the same in both, even Jesus Christ; but in this, that the signs of the old were prophetical, promising Christ; ours historical, pointing at Christ already come in the flesh; so as we, with St. Paul, may say more effectually, "Christ, who died for me, and gave Himself for me,"* than any Israelite under the law can say, "Christ, the Messiah, that shall die and give Himself for me."

2. Ours exceed theirs *gradu claritatis*, in the measure of manifestation, being, as Augustine saith, *numero paucissima*, less burthensome for number; *intellectu augustissima, significatione præstantissima*, more excellent for signification, more lively for representation.† To them of old it was, *Hoc facite in mei præfigurationem*, "Do this in prefiguration of me:" to us it is, "Do this in commemoration of me." To them, *prænuntiare;* to us, *annuntiare;* they foreshewed His death; we shew forth His death to the end of the world (1 Cor. xi.) Ours are of longer continuance than theirs.‡ Ours are clear, theirs were obscure: as Nazianzen§ spake elegantly of the passover, that it was τυποῦ τυπὸς ἀμυδρότερος, a more obscure type of a type: and so were theirs of old.

§ 3.—*The Third Objection drawn,* à mutatione, *answered.*

Objection.

Ballarmine's third proof is drawn *à mutatione panis*, from the change or conversion of bread; the Fathers speak of a real change.

Solution.

1. The Fathers use the terms of conversion and mutation; what then? *ergo*, transubstantiation? It followeth not. For this is to argue from the general to the special: as if you should say, it is a colour, therefore it is black, there being colours besides black. Change is a general word, and there are divers kinds thereof, besides the change of substance. The Fathers, therefore, speaking of a change in the sacrament, may as well mean a change of alteration in the use, condition, and virtue of the elements, as of substance, by way of transubstantiation.

2. We deny not a change, an alteration, or transmutation, or trans-

* Gal. ii., 20. † De Doctrina Christian. l. 3. c. 9. et Epist. 118. ad Januar.
‡ See Cent. 1. Artic. 5. § Orat. in Pascha.

elementation, as Damascen and Theophylact speak:* but a change of the elements; that is, their transmutation and trans-elementation doth not conclude transubstantiation. For in the other two the matter remaineth; but in this the matter is destroyed, the quantity and accidents only remain. There is a conversion sacramental, that is, of signification, use, and operation; as in the water in baptism, where the change is without any transubstantiation.

3. In conversions that are substantial, whether by divine or course ordinary, there is evermore *tertium quid, novum, noviter productum,* out of that which is converted: but in transubstantiation, the body of Christ is not produced anew, nor receiveth any substantial change.

4. It is not then Cyril's μεταβολὴ, nor Nyssen's μετασχηματισμὸς, nor Chrysostom's, and his abbreviator's Theophylact, their μεταστοιχείωσις, or trans-elementation: nor Damascen's μεταποίησις, that reacheth home to their Romish μετουσίωσις, and transubsantiation. It is not Cyprian's *panis natura mutatus,* nor Ambrose's *in aliud commutantur,* or any other of the Latin Fathers *transit, transfertur,* or *transmutantur,* that can conclude their transubstantiation.

Objection.

Cyprian saith, *panis natura mutatus,* bread changed in nature.† Ambrose saith, *Benedictione natura ipsa mutatur;* doth not change in nature, infer a change in substance?‡

Solution.

It is inconsequent to argue, they are changed in their nature, *ergo,* their natural substance is destroyed. For nature implieth qualities and properties, as well as substance; and it is taken *theologice* as well *physice;* for St. Peter, speaking of regenerate persons, saith, that they are made partakers Θείας φύσεως, of the divine nature, and yet their former substance not abolished;§ the nature of glorious bodies is changed, and they are made spiritual,‖ and yet they retain the same substance, but partake the qualities of a glorified body: man's nature was changed after his fall, yet the substance of his nature remained.¶

§ 4.—*The Fourth Objection drawn* a mysterii altitudine, *answered.*

Objection.

The fourth is taken from the height of the mystery which the

* Dam. Cent. 8. Theo. Cent. 11. † De Cœna Domini, Cent. 3.
‡ De myster. initiand. c. 9. Cent. 4. § 2 Peter i., 4. ‖ 1 Cor. xv., 44.
¶ Ephes. ii., 3.

ancients* acknowledged to be so great in the Eucharist, that they concealed it from catechumens, and unbaptized Christians: which had been needless, had they thought (as Protestants do) Christ present in the sacrament only in *signo*, and not really as we do.

Solution.

1. This caution and concealment of theirs shews this much; that it was held unlawful in those ages to treat or dispute of the Holy Eucharist *intempestive*, that is, before heathens (infidelity is a mocker) which were not at all instructed in the first principles of religion, or to treat of this doctrine in profane places or auditories: but what is this to the real presence by transubstantiation? For it was held unlawful in the primitive Church, in manner aforesaid, that is, in an undue time, order and place to treat or dispute of the mysteries of baptism,† or of other profound mysteries belonging to Christian faith; and yet this without any conceit of transubstantiation. The Fathers said of the mysteries of the Eucharist,‡ *norunt fidelis*, the faithful know what we say. And they said as much for the mysteries of baptism,§ ἅπερ ἴσασιν οἱ πιστοὶ, the faithful know this, and yet no corporal presence in baptism.

2. Now for Christ's presence only *in signo;* they misreport our tenet: for we hold a presence of Christ's body in the sacrament no less true than they themselves, and not a bare and naked sign without fruit and effect.

3. Yea, but the Fathers, Cyril and Eusebius Emissenus by name, forbid us to doubt of Christ's words, or to inquire the manner how?‖ We doubt not of them; we think the manner to be inexplicable. We believe Christ's words in His own sense. We do not inquire after them with a *quomodo infidelitatis*, not out of infidelity and distrust, as the Jews did in John vi., 52, as if we believed not the speaker; but with a *quomodo φιλομαθείας*, for our better information; as the blessed Virgin said, "How shall this be" (Luke i., 34). Christ said, "This is my body;" we believe Him: He spake not of the *modus*, not of the manner how: we agree with you in the object, we differ about the *modus*, touching the manner.

* Concil. Alexandrin. apud Athanasium, Apolog. 2 Epist. Julii. ibid.

† Καὶ μοι μηδεὶς ἀτέλεστος ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν ἰέτω. Dionys. Hierarch. c. 2 de Baptismo.

‡ Augustin. de Civit. Dei, l. 10. c. 6. et passim.

§ Chrysostom. in Galat. 4.

‖ Cyril. 1, 4. in Joh. c. 13. Emmissen. Homil. 5. de Pasch. Cent. 5. art. 5. sec. 2.

§ 5.—*The Fifth Objection drawn* ab Adoratione et Invocatione Eucharistiæ, *answered.*

Objection.

The Fathers speak of the adoration and invocation of the host: Theodoret saith, *σύμβολα προσκυνεῖται*, "let the symbols be worshipped or adored."*

Solution.

1. He saith so; but Ribera the Jesuit acknowledgeth† that the term *προσκύνησις*, or adoration, is sometimes used for worship communicable to creatures; as namely, to angels, saints, and kings; and then he meant no more, but that they should be reverently handled, as becometh so great mysteries, as is already observed.‡

2. Besides, Christ may be adored in the mysteries, and yet the mysteries themselves not have such honour. St. Augustine saith: "The sacrament is to be differenced and discerned from other meats; *veneratione singulariter debita*, (that is, properly or) singularly due (unto it).§ *Contemptum solum non vult cibus ille;* that meat (saith he) misliketh only contempt;" that is, either to be daily received without regard, or still refused upon pretence of unworthiness. St. Chrysostom saith, "We are to come to the sacrament, not at a venture, carelessly, or in homely manner, but *μετὰ πολλῆς φρίκης καὶ εὐλαβείας*, with much fear and reverence."|| And this reverence and veneration we yield unto it. Now, as for this term of veneration (far short of divine worship and adoration), St. Augustine ascribeth it to baptism as well as to the Eucharist, saying, "We reverence baptism wheresoever,"¶ and yet without any conceit of a corporal presence therein.

3. The Fathers used not any direct invocation of the Eucharist, but a rhetorical figure called *prosopopœia;* which is, when one calleth upon that which has no sense, as if it had sense: as, "Hear, O heavens, hearken, O earth" (Isa. i.) And thus the ancients called upon the element of baptism, "*O aqua quæ lavas omnia, nec lavaris;* O thou water that washest all other, and art not washed thyself." So saith Ambrose, "O water, which once purged the world."** So saith Optatus,†† without any conceit of a corporal presence in the font-water, as is already shewn in this evidence.‡‡

*Theodoret. Dialog. 2. † Ribera in cap. 19. Apocalyp.
‡ Cnt. 5. art. 5. sec. 3. of the Adoration of the Host. § Aug. Epist. 118. c. 3.
|| Chrysost. in 1. ad Corinth. Hom. 24.
¶ Aug. Epist. 164. Baptismum Christi ubique veneramur.
** In Luc. l. 10. 22. †† Optat. l. 6. contr. Parmen. ‡‡ Cent. 1. art, 5. sec. 3.

§ 6.—*The Sixth Classis drawn* ab Effectu Eucharistiæ, *answered.*

Objection.

Bellarmine's last head is taken from the wonderful effects which the Fathers ascribe to the Eucharist: they say that we are thereby corporally united to Christ.

Solution.

1. Indeed, Cyril (one that strains it as high as any of them), makes the union and conjunction between Christ and us,* real, natural, and bodily: we hold the same, in the like sense, as St. Paul said,† that we are *σύσσωμα*, con-corporal, of the same body: in the same sense as he said, that "we are all bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh;"‡ alluding to the making of Eve, the woman out of Adam's side; or, as the same St. Paul saith, and the Fathers from him, that we are *σύμφυτοι, complantati*, planted together by baptism in the likeness of Christ's death:§ all which may be done by faith and the Spirit, without partaking of the sacrament; and yet this wonderful union, wrought by faith, is sealed up unto us in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the communion of the body and blood of Christ.||

2. And this may serve in answer to Bellarmine's *Synopsis Patrum*. If farther satisfaction herein be desired, it may be had in Alstedius's Supplement,¶ annexed to Chamierus's fourth tome of his *Panstratia Catholica*. And more fully in the learned Bishop of Durham's accurate treatise of the institution of the blessed sacrament;** and yet more punctually in his late learned decision of the whole doctrinal controversy about the Eucharist;†† where (besides other judicious determinations) he shall meet with an exact abridgment of the speeches of the ancient Fathers objected by Bellarmine and others, for proof of a corporal presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, assoiled and satisfied by the parallels and like equivalent sayings of the same Fathers touching the sacrament of baptism.

And now let the reader, after he has well weighed the *allegata* and *probata* out of the Fathers, judge, whether the Romish device of the substance of the bread and wine to be flown away and gone, and in the room thereof, a remainder of nothing else but accidents to stay behind, were known to antiquity or not.

* Cyril. Alexander. Cent. 5. art. 5. sec. 2. † Ephes. iii., 6. ‡ Ephes. v., 30.
§ Rom. vi., 5. || 1 Cor. x., 16. ¶ Cap. 6. sec. 11
** Book 8. c. 2. sec. 3.
†† Totius Doctrinalis Controversiæ de Eucharistia Decisio. Part. 3. per totum.

WAKEFIELD:
CHARLES HICKS, PRINTER, MARKET-PLACE.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01031 0797